

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

92

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 136--82nd Congress

Chapter 375--1st Session

H. R. 3790

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Digest of Public 136	1
Index and Summary of H. R. 3790	2

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION ACT, 1952. Includes funds for construction of a transmission line from Clark Hill Dam to Greenwood, South Carolina; for Southeastern, Southwestern, and Bonneville Power Administrations; for the Bureau of Land Management, including soil and moisture conservation on the public lands and funds for construction of access roads to timber on the O and C lands; for the Bureau of Reclamation, including funds for soil and moisture conservation on Reclamation lands; for Geological Survey, National Park Service; Fish and Wildlife Service; Office of Territories; and public works in Alaska and the Virgin Islands.

Amend the language providing for a continuing fund for the construction of power transmission facilities to restrict its use for the purchase of energy and the rental of facilities.

Prohibits the construction of transmission lines in areas covered by power wheeling contracts which provide for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers.

Limits the use of funds for employment of persons to perform publicity and informational work to 75% of the funds requested in the 1952 estimates for such purposes.

Restricts the employment of chauffeurs and limits personnel employees to a ratio of 1 to every 110 employees.

Includes a provision limiting the filling of vacancies that occur during the fiscal year 1952, with certain functions excepted and with a stipulation that when the total number of personnel subject to the provision has been reduced to 90 % of the total provided for the 1952 estimates, it shall cease to apply.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF HISTORY ON H.R. 3790

February 13, 1951	Hearings: House, Part 1
February 23, 1951	Hearings: House, Part 2
April 20, 1951	House Committee on Appropriations, reported H. R. 3790. Report 339. Print of Bill as reported.
April 24, 1951	House began debate on H. R. 3790
April 25, 1951	House continued debate
May 1, 1951	House continued debate
May 2, 1951	House passed H. R. 3790 with amendments
May 3, 1951	Referred to Senate Committee on Appropriations. Print of Bill as referred.
May 8, 1951	Hearings: Senate, Part 1
May 25, 1951	Hearings: Senate, Part 2
July 2, 1951	Requested and obtained permission to report Bill during Senate recess.
July 3, 1951	Reported H. R. 3790 with amendments. Senate Report 499. Print of bill as reported.
July 5, 1951	Senate began debate
July 6, 1951	Continued debate
July 9, 1951	Senate continued debate
July 10, 1951	Continued debate
July 11, 1951	Continued debate
July 12, 1951	Continued debate
July 13, 1951	H. R. 3790 passed the Senate with amendments Print of bill as passed by the Senate Senate Conferees appointed
July 18, 1951	House conferees appointed
July 30, 1951	House received conference report. House Report 775.

July 31, 1951	House recommitted Conference Report 775 to Conference Committee.
August 16, 1951	House received second Conference Report Report 888.
August 17, 1951	House agrees to conference report
August 20, 1951	Senate agrees to conference report.
August 31, 1951	Approved: Public Law 136

1. The first part of the book is devoted to a general introduction to the subject of the book.	1-10
2. The second part of the book is devoted to a detailed study of the various aspects of the subject.	11-100
3. The third part of the book is devoted to a study of the various aspects of the subject.	101-200
4. The fourth part of the book is devoted to a study of the various aspects of the subject.	201-300
5. The fifth part of the book is devoted to a study of the various aspects of the subject.	301-400

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

APRIL 20, 1951.—Committed to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. R. 3790]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1952.

SCOPE OF THE BILL

The bill provides regular annual appropriations for all of the various activities under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department.

APPROPRIATIONS AND ESTIMATES

A tabulation is presented at the end of this report detailing appropriations in the bill for 1952, the budget estimates for 1952, the amounts appropriated for 1951, and the amount of each appropriation as reduced pursuant to Section 1214 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951. A comparison is provided of the amounts recommended in the bill with the appropriations for 1951 as reduced under the aforementioned Section 1214, and also with the 1952 estimates.

The Budget estimates of appropriations for the objects provided for in the bill may be found in the 1952 budget document at pages 584 through 693 inclusive, and in House Document No. 66.

A summary of totals follows:

The budget estimates for 1952 total.....	\$559, 286, 000
The committee recommends in the accompanying bill.....	\$520, 031, 500
This is a reduction under the budget estimates of.....	\$39, 254, 500
The amount recommended in the bill is a decrease below the 1951 appropriations (as reduced under section 1214) of.....	\$58, 654, 325

Notwithstanding the fact that the budget estimates for the Interior Department are substantially below the amounts of appropriations available after reductions under Section 1214 for the current year, the committee has made further reductions in keeping with the current national financial situation and the need for economy in government spending.

There follows a discussion of the committee's recommendations for the various bureaus and activities of the Department.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Enforcement of Connally Hot-oil Act.—An appropriation of \$174,000, the amount requested in the budget, has been approved for this purpose.

Power and Energy Studies, New England and New York.—An appropriation of \$35,000 was requested to provide for a small organization in the Office of the Secretary to participate in making a comprehensive study of the electric power and energy facilities in the New England-New York area. This has been denied by the committee since such an appropriation is not authorized by law. This action is without prejudice to the merits of the request, and legislative authorization for such program should be procured before appropriations are requested.

Construction, Southeastern Power Administration.—An appropriation of \$4,000,000 was requested for a program covering the construction of transmission facilities in conjunction with the marketing of Federal power generated at hydroelectric projects being developed by the Department of the Army in the Southeastern States. The 1952 program included transmission facilities for power from two river basins and the preparation of plans and specifications for the future program of the agency. The committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,400,000, representing a reduction of \$600,000 below the estimate.

The program for the Roanoke River basin involves a continuation with some enlargement, of the program already approved during the last Congress. The Committee has approved an appropriation of \$3,300,000 which covers funds for continuing the transmission line from Buggs Island Dam to Suffolk, Virginia, and from Suffolk to Langley Field, Virginia. All of the facilities listed by the Southeastern Power Administration for the Roanoke River basin program are approved except a line proposed from Suffolk to Gatesville, N. C. The latter line is denied.

The Savannah river basin program which proposed approval of 15 transmission lines has been denied entirely by the committee. This is not to be construed as denial of the right of preferred customers to the power and energy to be generated in the Savannah river basin, or necessarily as permanent denial of Government facilities for trans-

mitting such power to preferred customers. Representations were made to the committee that arrangements can be worked out for utilizing privately owned transmission facilities so as to enable preferred customers to obtain the power and energy to be available from Savannah river basin generating plants. All parties should make every effort toward that end so that there will be no discrimination with respect to the preferred customers in the area adjacent to the Savannah River basin.

Thus, no appropriation has been approved for the Savannah River basin program.

The estimate of \$100,000 has been approved in full to provide for plans and specifications for the future program.

Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration.—Of a request for \$300,000, the committee recommends that \$275,000 be approved. Revenues from plants now in operation which accrued during 1949 and 1950 were \$1,329,591 with estimated revenues for 1951 in excess of \$2 million, and for 1952 in excess of \$4 million.

Continuing fund, Southeastern Power Administration.—The budget proposed establishment of a continuing fund of \$200,000 to be derived from power receipts in the Southeastern power area. The committee has modified the proposal contained in the budget, and recommends the establishment of a fund in the amount of \$50,000 to be maintained from receipts. The fund recommended is to be available to defray only emergency expenses and those necessary under unusual circumstances to insure continuity of electric service and continuous operation of Government facilities in the area. It is not to be available for the rental of transmission or related facilities as regular operations, nor is it to be available for the purchase of electric power and energy to firm up the Government's system.

Construction, Southwestern Power Administration.—The committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,925,000 instead of \$4,100,000 as requested in the budget. This appropriation is recommended for carrying forward the construction of facilities to interconnect Federal generating and transmission facilities with other systems and customers. Completion of the Government's transmission system is planned in accordance with the scheduled availability of generation of power and energy in the Southwestern Power area.

The reduction of \$175,000 made by the committee is to eliminate funds requested for the purchase of the Dennison-Payne transmission line. A provision has been inserted in the bill authorizing the acquisition of such line without transfer of funds. Otherwise the program presented by the Southwestern Power Administration for 1952 is approved.

Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration.—An appropriation of \$1,275,000 is recommended instead of \$1,300,000 which was requested. On a comparable basis with the appropriation for the current fiscal year this is an increase of approximately \$50,000 which is necessitated by the enlarged operations of this agency.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

An appropriation of \$20,000, representing an increase from \$12,500 available in the current year and a decrease of \$7,000 in the amount requested, is recommended by the committee.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Construction.—An appropriation of \$67,500,000 is approved in lieu of the estimate of \$69,500,000. The sum recommended is to enable the Bonneville Administration to carry out its program of construction of transmission facilities already approved by the Congress and to initiate construction of additional facilities to conform with the schedules under which new generating capacity is to be available. Before the end of 1955 generation is scheduled to be provided by eight new plants in addition to the capacity still to be added at Grand Coulee Dam.

Although it recommended a general reduction of \$2,000,000 in the estimate, the committee has approved the Bonneville construction program as submitted with one additional item. A substation should be provided by BPA at Warden, Washington, and \$48,000 of the sum approved is to be available for that purpose.

Operation and maintenance.—An appropriation of \$5,250,000 has been approved by the committee for operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system and for marketing power and energy. This represents a reduction of \$250,000 in the amount requested.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

The budget estimate for 1952 is \$7,850,000, which compares with \$6,927,810 available for management of land and resources for the current fiscal year, after reductions made pursuant to section 1214 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951. An appropriation of \$7,700,000 is recommended. This sum is to be distributed among the following activities.

Lease and disposal of lands and mineral resources.—The committee has approved \$875,000, an increase of \$4,620 above the 1952 base for this activity.

Land classification.—The sum of \$555,000 is recommended for this activity, thus maintaining it substantially at the current level. A small increase of \$1,015 above the current year base has been approved.

Grazing administration.—For management of grazing lands \$1,400,000 is provided in the bill. The increase of \$370,680 above the base amount for the current fiscal year has the approval of the committee because the grazing fee is to be increased an average of 4 cents per animal unit per month. This action appears to be in harmony with the philosophy of the Taylor Grazing Act whereby grazing fees are expected to offset the cost of administering grazing lands.

Forest management.—The amount approved for forest management is \$1,730,000. This represents an increase of \$295,800 above the base amount for the current fiscal year. \$190,000 of this sum is to cover the increased costs of fire-protection and the remainder of the increase is to permit better management of our timber resources generally.

Cadastral surveys.—For this activity, which is to be conducted at substantially the same level as at present, \$765,000 has been approved.

Soil and moisture conservation.—For this important activity \$1,200,000 is recommended by the committee. This represents an increase of

\$304,150 above the base amount for the current fiscal year, which is urgently required because 76,000,000 acres of public land are in a state of severe and even critical erosion. While some rehabilitation has been undertaken on approximately 17,000,000 acres of this land the committee feels that it is of great importance to increase the scale of this work in the fiscal year 1952.

Squaw Butte Experimentation Station.—\$35,000 is approved for this activity, which provides an increase of \$1,600 above the current year base amount.

Fire suppression.—The sum of \$150,000, representing an increase of \$100,000 above the current year amount has been approved for this activity. This increase is based on the average cost of fire suppression for the past five years, and is designed to provide funds so that the cost can be met without seeking deficiency appropriations.

General administration.—For general administration of the Bureau of Land Management \$990,000 is approved. This represents an increase of \$11,200 over the base sum available for the current fiscal year.

CONSTRUCTION

An estimate of \$1,000,000 was presented to finance the construction of access roads to stands of timber in the re-vested Oregon and California grant lands. While not denying the merit of such roads, the committee has rejected this estimate. The committee was willing to provide funds for the initiation of an access road program in prior years on the assumption that the legislation relating to the distribution of receipts from the sale of timber would be modified. The existing law provides for an inordinate proportion of the receipts from such timber sales to be distributed to counties of Oregon. The Federal Government cannot be expected to invest in capital improvements, even for such valuable natural resources, when the financial proceeds of harvesting these resources accrue in excessive proportion to a small number of counties rather than to the Federal Treasury. The committee will be unwilling to provide for capital expenditures of this nature unless and until substantial adjustments are made regarding the distribution of receipts of timber sales from the O & C and Coos Bay grant lands.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

The budget program submitted for the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the fiscal year 1952 amounts to a total of \$71,425,000, and is designed to carry out the major responsibilities of the United States toward the Indian people, including the management of trust property—its protection and development, and also the provision of services otherwise not available to Indians, which are normally provided to other citizens through other sources. Although recognizing the necessity to provide material assistance, the committee feels that increasing emphasis must be placed on active, tangible progress toward the assimilation of Indians into the general population. Unless this is done the Indians will inevitably continue in their dependent status and will never be able fully to enjoy the privileges and opportunities of American citizenship.

The committee has provided a total of \$65,000,000 for the activities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the fiscal year 1952. The bill is so drawn as to permit the Interior Department to have complete flexibility to allocate the funds for the most essential purposes. A lump sum appropriation of \$65,000,000 has been made, and the current year's appropriation form and estimates are left intact as limitations on funds for the various categories of activity. This will permit the Department to approve expenditures for any activities, projects, or parts thereof, which were included in its budget presentation, but not for any item which was not in the program presented to Congress, except emergency flood control.

It has come to the attention of the committee that certain attorneys employed by groups of Indians are rendering services and engaging in activities which appear to be not in the best interest of their Indian clients. The Commissioner is to be commended for the efforts he is making to correct these abuses. Indians are entitled to legal counsel and representation whenever their interests are at issue. However, they should not be mulcted by unscrupulous attorneys, and so long as the Secretary of the Interior has the responsibility for approving contracts of Indians for legal services, he should undertake to protect the Indians from unethical and unfair practices of lawyers. The committee does not advocate excessive paternalism in such matters but does recommend that the Secretary require that any lawyers employed by Indians render legal services of a legitimate and ethical nature to their clients. Champertous activities involving the affairs of Indians should not be tolerated. Nor should persons employed as attorneys for Indians be permitted to serve as press agents, publicity counsel, or to render other than legal services. It is recommended that the Secretary enlist the assistance of reputable bar association groups in order that the Indians as well as the legal profession should not be damaged by the nefarious activities of an unscrupulous few.

There follows a discussion of the various principal categories of appropriations to be available for the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE SERVICES

For this category of functions the committee has approved a program to cost not in excess of \$43,600,000.

Hospitals, disease-preventative and curative services.—This activity covers hospitals, sanitoriums, and medical centers and other health facilities. It also covers preventative and curative health services. For financing these services the committee has approved not to exceed \$15,983,000, compared with the base amount for the current year of \$14,811,466.

Educational assistance facilities and services.—The Bureau of Indian Affairs operates boarding and day schools and extends financial assistance on behalf of Indian children in public, mission, and other schools. For carrying out this program the committee has approved not to exceed \$23,260,000, compared with \$21,732,628, the base amount for the current fiscal year.

Welfare and guidance services.—Not to exceed \$2,382,500 is recommended to finance welfare and social services to Indians and technical and advisory services to governing bodies of Indian tribes in 1952,

as compared with the base amount of \$1,941,609 for the current fiscal year.

Placement services.—A program of assistance to Indians who live on overcrowded reservations for finding non-reservation employment opportunities is approved for not to exceed \$1,644,800. The sum available for the current fiscal year for placement services is \$280,000.

Maintaining law and order.—For law enforcement activities the committee has approved not to exceed \$329,700 which compares with the current year's base sum of \$295,033.

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

For carrying out the functions of management, development, improvement and protection of the resources of Indians not to exceed \$11,400,000 has been approved. The base amount available for these activities in fiscal 1951 was \$10,606,576.

Forest and range lands.—For managing, protecting and utilizing of Indian forest, range, range-water, and wildlife resources on Indian lands the committee recommends not to exceed \$1,663,607, which compares with \$1,536,123 base amount available in 1951.

Fire suppression.—Not to exceed \$150,000 has been approved for fire suppression and prevention. The base amount available for this activity in 1951 was \$12,000. The estimate for 1952 is designed to eliminate the necessity for deficiency appropriations for this purpose.

Agricultural and industrial assistance.—This provides for improving farming, homemaking and small business enterprises. Not to exceed \$1,932,000 has been approved for 1952, compared with \$1,460,519, the base amount available for the current fiscal year.

Soil and moisture conservation.—The 1951 amount for better land-use practices and erosion control was \$1,561,470. The program for 1952 is approved for not to exceed the same amount.

Operation, repair, and maintenance of Indian irrigation systems.—For 1952 not to exceed \$835,000 has been approved for operating and maintaining irrigation projects on Indian lands. The program for 1952 compares with an amount of \$810,952 available during the fiscal year 1951.

Repair and maintenance of roads and trails.—Not to exceed \$2,240,130 is recommended for maintaining roads serving isolated Indian areas; \$2,240,130 is available for the current fiscal year.

Development of Indian arts and crafts.—The sum available for 1951 for this purpose was \$45,250. For 1952 the committee has approved not to exceed the same amount.

Management of Indian trust property.—This activity provides for the management of Indian trust property and funds. Not to exceed \$1,163,800 has been approved by the committee for 1952. This compares with \$1,131,389 available for the current year.

Repair and maintenance of buildings and utilities.—A sum not in excess of the amount available for the current year namely, \$1,808,743, has been approved.

CONSTRUCTION

Not to exceed \$12,000,000 has been approved by the committee for construction, major repair and improvement of buildings, utilities,

roads and trails, and other facilities. This compares with available funds of \$19,137,651 for the fiscal year 1951.

Buildings and utilities.—For 1952, not to exceed \$7,877,000 is provided in the bill for the construction of hospitals, schools, and other buildings and facilities. This compares with \$13,142,100 available in 1951.

Roads and trails.—Not to exceed \$1,500,000, as compared with \$1,883,421 available in the current fiscal year, has been approved for 1952.

Irrigation systems.—\$2,623,000 has been approved for 1952 for the construction and rehabilitation of irrigation works on Indian reservations. The amount available in 1951 is \$3,974,630.

Land acquisition.—\$137,500 is available for this activity in 1951, but no funds were requested or are provided for this purpose in fiscal 1952.

Emergency flood control work.—The committee's attention has been called to the need for a fund to take care of emergency flood control work for protection of Indian lands. No provision was made in the budget for such funds. The sum of \$50,000 should be made available from the total appropriation made in the accompanying bill to take care of emergency flood control work.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The committee recommends not to exceed \$3,600,000 for general administrative expenses incident to the over-all direction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, both in the District of Columbia and in the respective field offices. For this activity in 1951 \$3,600,000 is available.

A report by the committee's investigative staff indicated that there are deficiencies both in the organizational structure of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and with respect to certain undesirable practices which apparently have not been adequately controlled. The Commissioner has indicated his desire to utilize the information developed in the investigative report and to take necessary corrective action. The committee urges him to do so, thoroughly and promptly.

REVOLVING FUND FOR LOANS

Not to exceed \$800,000 is recommended for augmenting the fund for loans to Indian corporations and tribes. This compares with an appropriation of \$2,400,000 in 1951.

PAYMENT TO CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW NATIONS OF INDIANS— OKLAHOMA

Not to exceed \$25,000 is recommended for expenses incident to the distribution of funds made available to these tribes in 1949.

TRIBAL FUNDS

An appropriation of \$2,080,000 from tribal funds not otherwise available for expenditure has been approved by the committee. This includes \$5,000 for employment of an attorney by the Creek Nation of Indians pursuant to request of its tribal council.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The budget estimates for the Bureau of Reclamation for 1952 have been reduced substantially below the specific amounts of appropriation for the fiscal year 1951 which totaled \$325,494,000. This sum was reduced under section 1214 of the General Appropriation Act for 1951 to \$271,544,000. The budget estimates for 1952 total \$252,075,000. The committee has made further reductions in the amount of \$18,500,000 and recommends a total appropriation of \$233,575,000. The funds approved by the committee will permit the continuation of a balanced reclamation program, including both irrigation and power development. Expansion of existing power developments are provided for by extension of certain transmission facilities and the start of two relatively small power plants at dams already constructed. Continuation of work on extension of irrigation features already under way is also provided for. No new projects are approved by the committee nor has approval been given to the initiation of work on new major irrigation features of existing projects.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

The committee has approved an appropriation of \$5,000,000 for financing surveys and investigations. The amount approved represents a reduction of \$500,000 in the estimate submitted and compares with \$5,500,000 available for the current fiscal year. The reduction made by the committee is to be applied against the estimate for engineering and economic investigations.

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

The construction and rehabilitation program has been approved in the amount of \$207,190,000 representing a reduction of \$16,500,000 below the 1952 estimate and a reduction of \$36,543,000 below the appropriation for the current fiscal year as reduced under section 1214 of the General Appropriation Act.

The following list of projects indicates the respective amounts approved by the committee for each.

Name of project	Budget estimate	Approved by committee	Change
Gila project, Arizona.....	\$6,870,000	\$6,200,000	-\$670,000
Boulder Canyon project, Arizona-Nevada.....	2,900,000	2,900,000	-----
Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada.....	8,072,000	8,072,000	-----
All-American Canal, Arizona-California.....	180,000	1,864,000	+1,684,000
Cachuma project, California.....	11,150,000	10,000,000	-1,150,000
Central Valley project, California.....	38,350,000	33,870,000	-4,480,000
Kern River project, California.....	75,000	75,000	-----
Kings River project, California.....	12,000	12,000	-----
Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado.....	19,300,000	19,000,000	-300,000
Paonia project, Colorado.....	186,000	186,000	-----
San Luis Valley project, Colorado.....	622,800	600,000	-22,800
Boise project, Idaho, Payette Division.....	154,200	154,200	-----
Minidoka project, Idaho, American Falls power division.....	1,300,000	1,300,000	-----
Buffalo Rapids project, Montana, first division.....	100,000	100,000	-----
Buffalo Rapids project, Montana, second division.....	77,600	77,600	-----
Fort Peck project, Montana.....	1,633,000	1,500,000	-133,000
Hungry Horse project, Montana.....	22,972,000	22,000,000	-972,000
Sun River project, Montana.....	40,400	40,400	-----
Fort Sumner project, New Mexico.....	64,000	64,000	-----
Tueamearl project, New Mexico.....	244,000	200,000	-44,000
Rio Grande project, New Mexico-Texas.....	1,088,000	1,288,000	+200,000

Name of project	Budget estimate	Approved by committee	Change
W. C. Austin project, Oklahoma.....	\$135,000	\$135,000	-----
Deschutes project, Oregon, north unit.....	313,700	300,000	-\$13,700
Klamath project, Oregon-California.....	434,400	400,000	-34,400
Provo River project, Utah.....	2,748,000	2,200,000	-548,000
Columbia Basin project, Washington.....	27,900,000	27,000,000	-900,000
Yakima project, Washington, Roza division.....	48,600	48,600	-----
Eden project, Wyoming.....	2,000,000	1,900,000	-100,000
Kendrick project, Wyoming.....	2,575,000	2,250,000	-325,000
Riverton project, Wyoming.....	1,000,000	900,000	-100,000
Shoshone project, Wyoming.....	204,300	200,000	-4,300
Eklutna project, Alaska.....	5,761,400	5,761,400	-----
Colorado River front work and levee system, Arizona-California-Nevada.....	2,445,000	2,000,000	-445,000
Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects.....	4,000,000	3,000,000	-1,000,000
Missouri River Basin project:			
Phase A:			
Bostwick division.....	1,982,300	1,900,000	-82,300
Boysen division: Boysen unit.....	1,958,060	1,900,000	-58,060
Cheyenne division:			
Angostura unit.....	1,251,906	1,200,000	-51,906
Keyhole unit.....	1,282,700	1,282,700	-----
Frenchman-Cambridge division.....	8,400,018	8,000,000	-400,018
Grand division: Shadehill unit.....	506,000	500,000	-6,000
Heart division:			
Dickinson unit.....	11,000	11,000	-----
Heart Butte unit.....	509,000	500,000	-9,000
Helena-Great Falls division: Canyon Ferry unit.....	8,678,000	8,000,000	-78,000
North Dakota pumping division: Fort Clark unit.....	102,000	100,000	-2,000
North Platte division: Glendo unit.....	310,000	275,000	-35,000
Smoky Hill division: Cedar Bluff unit.....	1,310,141	500,000	-810,141
South Platte division: Narrows unit.....	24,000	50,000	+26,000
Three Forks division: Crow Creek unit.....	100,000	100,000	-----
Transmission division.....	18,709,640	14,963,300	-3,746,340
Upper Republican division: St. Francis unit.....	334,141	134,000	-200,141
Yellowstone division:			
Cartwright unit.....	33,800	33,800	-----
Sadie Flat unit.....	551,900	550,000	-1,900
Sidney unit.....	521,000	500,000	-21,000
Subtotal, phase A.....	46,015,600	40,499,800	-5,515,800
Phase B.....	3,566,000	3,000,000	-566,000
Phase C.....	3,500,000	3,000,000	-500,000
Phase D.....	92,000	92,000	-----
Other Department of the Interior agencies.....	5,500,000	5,000,000	-500,000
Total, Missouri River Basin.....	58,673,600	51,591,300	-7,082,300
Total, construction and rehabilitation.....	223,690,000	207,190,000	-16,500,000

In addition to the general modifications which may be required in the construction program for 1952 under reductions made in the estimates for the respective projects, the following specific action has been taken by the committee with respect to certain items.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

The estimate submitted for the Central Valley project for 1952 is approved in amount of \$33,870,000 to cover all requested program items except the following which are specifically denied by the committee:

Program item	1952 amount
Contra Costa Distribution System.....	\$630,000
Transmission facilities:	
Keswick-Tracy via Elverta 115-kv. line.....	1,400,000
Port Chicago-Mare Island 115-kv. line and substation.....	300,000
Tracy-Patterson-Naval Supply 69-kv. line and substation.....	450,000
CVP-BPA Interconnection and substation, 230-kv.....	1,700,000

Testimony indicates that \$630,000 requested for "Contra Costa Distribution System" was to be used for initiating construction of an aqueduct to serve the Southwest Contra Costa County Water

District which is within the boundaries of the East Bay Municipal Utility District on the east side of San Francisco Bay. Owing to lack of agreement between two competing public agencies the \$630,000 item under reference has been deleted from the approved program. No funds in the accompanying bill or previously appropriated are to be available for the design or construction of works to deliver water within the boundaries of the East Bay Municipal Utility District, California.

The deletion from the budget program of the three transmission lines indicated was made possible by the execution of a contract between the major privately owned utility company in California and the Bureau of Reclamation whereby the transmission of Government power over the company's lines to serve the Government's customers was provided for. The committee is happy to note the execution of this contract and hopes that it will be utilized to assist in serving the preferred customers as fully as possible.

The CVP-BPA interconnection is not to be considered as authorized and no expenditure of funds should be made in fiscal 1952 from any appropriation available to the Bureau for reconnaissance, preliminary survey, design, construction, or any other work in connection with this proposed line.

PROPOSED INTER-CONNECTION OF CENTRAL VALLEY POWER SYSTEM WITH BONNEVILLE POWER SYSTEM

Last year when it was learned that the Bureau of Reclamation sought authorization but no funds for the construction of a transmission line to connect the Central Valley project and the Bonneville Power system the committee included on page 171 of its report on the General Appropriation Bill, 1951, the following statement in reference thereto:

This line is not to be considered as authorized and no expenditure of funds should be made in fiscal 1951 from any appropriation available to the Bureau for reconnaissance, preliminary survey, design, or any other work in connection with this proposed line.

Testimony elicited by the committee indicates that during the fiscal year 1951 there was active consideration and discussion by officials of the Department of the Interior with respect to surveys and construction of the transmission line in question and with respect to the expenditure of funds for such purpose. Testimony also indicates that the Secretary of the Interior directed the Commissioner of Reclamation to stop any survey work of the proposed line, and that the Secretary has not given his approval for the use of funds during the fiscal year 1951 for surveys, plans, or designs in connection with this proposed transmission facility.

On page 159 of its report on the General Appropriation Bill, 1951, the committee included the following statement:

Assurance has been given by the Secretary of the Interior that the intent of Congress in approving appropriations and allocations of funds to various activities and for specific objects will be scrupulously observed even though the appropriation act does not so specify in detail.

Other testimony received by the committee during the course of recent hearings indicates that for the fiscal year 1951 \$116,084 has been expended through December, 1950, for surveys of transmission

lines in the area north of Shasta Dam to the Oregon border. The area in which this expenditure for surveys was made is the identical geographical area through which the inter-tie between the Bonneville and Central Valley power systems has been proposed. The surveys were made for the construction of transmission lines. Notwithstanding explanations offered by representatives of the Department, the conclusion is inescapable that the Bureau of Reclamation has expended funds in direct contravention of the clearly expressed intent of Congress and positive instructions issued by the Secretary. Despite the full assurances given by the Secretary, a violation of comity between the Interior Department and the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress, has been committed by the Bureau of Reclamation. The committee hereby requests the Secretary to investigate all facts surrounding this situation and to report promptly his findings thereon together with a report on disciplinary action taken by him, if any, in the premises.

COACHELLA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM, ALL-AMERICAN CANAL, CALIF.

An appropriation of \$1,684,000 has been included in the bill to be available for work toward the completion of construction of the distribution system of the Coachella division of the All-American Canal. This is recommended in the hope that this distribution system can be completed at the earliest practicable time.

The funds in the bill are provided to complete construction of Unit 9 of the distribution system by the Bureau of Reclamation in accordance with the plan contained in Exhibit A of the contract between the Coachella County Water District and the United States. This action contemplates that Unit 8 of the distribution system be constructed by the water users. To that end the Bureau of Reclamation should provide such assistance as may be found practicable within the limit of available appropriations. It is suggested that the Secretary might be able to extend the developmental period up to ten years in order to assist the water users and the irrigation district in their financial arrangements for the completion of Unit No. 8.

As indicated by the provision inserted in the bill by the committee it will be necessary for the Secretary and the water users of the Coachella Valley to enter into supplemental repayment contracts before any of the funds contained in the bill are to be available for expenditure. In order to assist in working out an agreement it is hoped that consideration can be given to the allegations of error in the accounting charges against the Coachella construction account. If after careful review the Secretary feels that there were erroneous charges which might properly be made to other accounts, the committee hopes that adjustments will be made.

The foregoing plan is offered as a compromise in the hope that the work can be completed without delay, and it is intended that the entire matter be promptly worked out in one general agreement. The lands of the Coachella Valley provide some of the highest crop income per acre of any lands in the United States, and should comfortably permit the water users to carry repayment obligations necessary to complete the system.

The committee has had this matter under review for more than a year and considers that, in the light of all the facts, the present proposal goes as far as possible.

COLORADO BIG THOMPSON PROJECT

Attention of the committee has been called to the fact that no adequate provision is currently being made for the administration of the public-use areas at Shadow Mountain Lake, a feature of the Colorado-Big Thompson Project, and a local problem has resulted. The requested transfer of Bureau of Reclamation funds to the Park Service for this purpose is not authorized by law, and the Department should promptly seek such legislation as is deemed necessary.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

The action of the committee in reducing the estimate for the Transmission Division of the Missouri River Basin project from \$18,709,640 to \$14,963,300 includes specific denial by the committee of the following project items:

<i>Program item</i>	<i>1952 amount</i>
Canyon Ferry-Great Falls 115-kv. line and substation-----	\$753, 450
Canyon Ferry-Three Forks-Anaconda 115-kv. lines and substations--	703, 000
Miles City-Yellowtail 115-kv. lines and substations-----	85, 000
Yellowtail-Billings 115-kv. lines and substations-----	810, 000
Sioux City-Omaha line-----	207, 463
Omaha substation-----	70, 242
Sioux City-Storm Lake line-----	118, 428
Storm Lake-Dennison-Holland-Omaha line-----	30, 624
Sioux City-Sibley line-----	467, 613
Additional reduction-----	500, 490
Total-----	3, 746, 340

The general reduction of \$500,490 indicated is not to eliminate any specific project items.

The Bureau of Reclamation should adjust its program with respect to the Bostwick Division so as to initiate work on the Franklin Unit, which is said to be an essential part of the program which has been underway for some time.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

An appropriation of \$15,385,000 is recommended for operation and maintenance of irrigation facilities and of power facilities in 1952. This is a reduction of \$1,000,000 in the amount requested and compares with the sum of \$15,447,000 available in the current year, after reductions under section 1214.

A provision recommended in the budget has been included in the bill whereby no appropriations in the accompanying bill are to be available for the payment of the cost of operation and maintenance of Imperial Dam and part of the All-American Canal for specified purposes until satisfactory annual payment arrangements have been made.

A provision in the bill indicates that the funds are to be available for carrying out functions as provided in treaties, but it is to be understood that inclusion of the words *and treaties* in the bill is definitely not intended to signify that the Congress is determining that any treaty delegates functions or duties to or imposes any obligations upon the Department of the Interior.

The funds available for maintenance of the Palo Verde rock weir are to be available for regular maintenance and not merely for "emergency" maintenance.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The committee has approved \$5,500,000 for the general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Reclamation, including the offices in Washington and Denver and the regional offices. This compares with the current year amount of \$6,864,000, after reductions under section 1214, and represents a reduction of \$500,000 below the 1952 estimate of \$6,000,000. The committee has received reports of inefficiencies and overstaffing in the Bureau of Reclamation in several parts of the country. Hoarding valuable personnel, including engineers and other technicians whose services might much better be applied to the national defense effort, is inexcusable. While testimony indicates that the Bureau of Reclamation is giving attention to its personnel requirements by self-imposed ceilings, the reduction of construction and other reclamation activities makes it imperative that the Bureau of Reclamation vigorously reduce administrative and other personnel and take firm action toward consolidating its regional and district organizations and eliminating duplications.

EMERGENCY FUND

The estimate of \$500,000 for augmenting the emergency fund authorized by the Act of June 26, 1948, is approved.

Appropriations to the emergency fund are to be used to assure continuous operation of irrigation and power systems of the bureau only in the event of emergency conditions such as droughts, canal-bank failures, generator failures, and damage to transmission lines.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

The budget estimate of \$22,900,000 is recommended for approval by the committee for the activities of the Geological Survey. This compares with an appropriation of \$18,882,000, as reduced under section 1214 of the General Appropriation Act for the current fiscal year.

Topographic surveys and mapping.—The estimate of \$8,930,000, representing an increase of \$1,650,000 over the current year base, has been approved for a program financed by direct appropriation, state cooperative offerings, and an allocation from Missouri River Basin development funds.

Geological and mineral resource surveys and mapping.—For this activity \$6,130,000 is recommended, representing an increase of \$1,720,000 above the current year base amount. The increase is to provide for acceleration of mineral resource studies, increasing the scope of investigations of mineral fuels, expansion in general service geologic mapping and remodeling space in the Denver Federal Center.

Water resource investigations.—These investigations provide basic water facts required for economical development and best use of the nation's water resources. An appropriation of \$6,015,000, representing an increase of \$797,000 above the current year base, is recommended.

Soil and moisture conservation.—The estimate of \$41,000, which keeps the activity under this heading at the same level as the current year, is approved by the committee.

Classification of lands.—The committee recommends \$354,000, as requested in the budget for investigation and classification of Federal lands with respect to mineral and water resources. This represents an increase of \$31,000 over the current year base.

Supervision of mining, oil, and gas leases.—The budget estimate of \$910,000 is recommended for approval. This is \$65,000 in excess of the base amount for the current fiscal year. Increased funds for 1952 are to provide an operating staff about 25 percent greater than in 1944 to handle a workload approximately 200 percent greater.

General administration.—The estimate of \$520,000, representing a \$55,000 increase over the amount available for the current year, is approved.

BUREAU OF MINES

For the Bureau of Mines the committee has approved appropriations totaling \$24,280,000. This is a reduction of \$341,100 below the appropriation available for the current year after the reductions under Section 1214, and represents a decrease of \$750,000 below the amended budget estimates.

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERALS RESOURCES

Of an estimate of \$18,700,000, the committee recommends approval of \$17,950,000 for conserving and developing mineral resources including fuels and minerals and metals, and controlling mine fires.

Fuels.—The budget estimate for activities under this heading total \$11,219,500, and has been approved in not to exceed the amount requested for research and engineering investigations on coal and its utilization; for engineering and other research on the development and production of petroleum and natural gas; for the development of processes for the production of synthetic liquid fuels; and also for research on helium and its uses. The budget program under the heading fuels has been approved as presented, except insofar as adjustments may be necessary for increasing the sum to be available for control of fires in inactive coal mines.

Minerals and metals.—The original 1952 budget estimate for investigations and research in the field of metals and other minerals amounted to \$6,680,500, as compared with \$5,949,058, base amount for the current fiscal year. A supplemental estimate of \$750,000 was considered for work at Laramie, Wyoming, on the recovery of alumina from anorthosite rock and clay. Undertaking such a program at this time is not justified, and this supplemental budget request is denied. Subject to the absorption of funds for control of fires in inactive coal deposits, the request for minerals and metals activity is approved as proposed in the budget.

Control of fires in inactive coal deposits.—The budget estimate for this activity is \$50,000 for the fiscal year 1952 as compared with the base amount of \$306,196 available for the current fiscal year. For controlling or extinguishing fires on publicly owned lands or those in inactive or abandoned deposits on private property, the committee has approved \$356,000. This sum is to be absorbed from the total appropriation approved for the conservation and development of mineral resources.

HEALTH AND SAFETY

The budget estimate of \$3,790,000 is approved as submitted. This compares with \$3,805,000 available for this work during the current fiscal year. The program includes investigation of accidents and rescue work, and mine inspections and investigations leading to recommendations to eliminate or alleviate hazards.

CONSTRUCTION

The budget estimate of \$1,250,000 includes provision for construction of new laboratory facilities, continuation of work on the drainage tunnel at Leadville, Colorado, and for minor construction and alterations with respect to the synthetic liquid fuel program. The estimate is recommended for approval as submitted. This represents a reduction of \$618,100 below the sum available for construction during the current fiscal year.

Testimony indicates that the Bureau of Mines is making efforts to obtain contracts to recapture the cost of constructing the tunnel facilities at Leadville, Colorado. The committee feels that great effort should be made toward this end in order that the investment of the Government in this facility can be fully reimbursed in the shortest time possible.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The budget estimate of \$1,290,000 for general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Mines is recommended by the committee for approval. This maintains the general administrative expense appropriation at the same level as in current fiscal year.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

The accompanying bill contains \$28,294,500 for the activities of the National Park Service for 1952. This represents a reduction of \$4,246,200 below the amount available in 1951, as reduced under Section 1214 of the General Appropriation Act, and a reduction of \$537,500 below the budget estimates for 1952.

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

An appropriation of \$7,735,000 is recommended by the committee for managing and protecting national parks, monuments, and recreational and other areas. This represents a reduction of \$441,000 below the 1952 estimate of \$8,176,000, and an increase of \$156,300 above the amount available for the current fiscal year.

Management of park and other areas.—\$6,600,000 is approved for the management of National Parks, Monuments, and other areas under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service. The amount recommended for 1952 represents an increase of \$389,000 above the base amount for fiscal 1951, which is needed to finance the operation of a larger number of areas in 1952 than in 1951.

Forestry and fire control.—For 1952, \$600,000 is approved. This represents an increase of approximately \$100,000 above the base amount available for the current fiscal year, and is designed to obviate the necessity of deficiency appropriations for fire protection.

Soil and moisture conservation.—\$96,000 is approved for this activity, which is equal to the amount available during the current year.

Plans and investigations.—The estimate of \$856,501 has been reduced by the committee to \$439,000. This is a decrease of \$251,400 below the base amount for 1951. A provision in the bill continues the availability of funds for the Mississippi River Parkway survey in order that it may be completed.

MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

An appropriation of \$7,300,000 is recommended by the committee for maintenance and rehabilitation of roads and trails, buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities of the National Parks Service. This represents a reduction of \$96,500 in the 1952 budget estimate and an increase of \$100,000 above the amount available for the current fiscal year, as reduced under Section 1214 of the General Appropriation Act. The Department should allocate the amount approved within the projects and activities contained in the budget submission for this estimate, since no specific project item has been denied by the committee.

CONSTRUCTION

The 1952 estimate of \$11,975,000 has been approved by the Committee. This represents a reduction of \$4,492,500 below the amount available for the current fiscal year.

Parkways.—\$5,825,000 is approved for the construction of parkways, and is to be distributed as follows: For the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, \$4,200,000; for the Natchez-Trace Parkway, \$800,000; and for the Suitland Parkway, \$825,000.

Roads and trails.—The budget estimate of \$3,000,000 is approved as presented for the construction of roads and trails. This is nearly half the amount available for this purpose during the current fiscal year.

Buildings and utilities.—The committee has approved \$1,400,000 as requested for the construction of buildings and utilities and other improvements. The amount available for this purpose for 1951 was \$2,940,000.

Acquisition of lands and water rights.—The program submitted in the budget for the acquisition of lands and water rights has been approved in the amount of \$1,750,000. This compares with the sum of \$3,077,000 available during the fiscal year 1951. The 1952 program contemplates the acquisition of certain lands for which specific legislation has been enacted, acquisition of water rights in Arizona and Utah, and the liquidation of prior year contractual authorization for acquiring properties necessary to the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park in Philadelphia.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The 1952 estimate of \$1,284,500 has been approved. This represents a reduction of \$10,000 below the amount available for the current year. The recommended appropriations will provide for general administrative expenses at approximately the same level as in the current fiscal year.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Total appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service are recommended by the committee in the amount of \$12,548,000. The committee has approved the total estimates submitted. The amount recommended in the bill compares with appropriations for the current year, as reduced under Section 1214, of \$13,577,950. The 1952 program is, therefore, \$1,029,950 below the current year.

MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES

Administration of fish and game laws.—The 1952 estimate of \$1,624,636 representing an increase of \$78,091 above the base amount for the current year is recommended for approval.

Propagation and distribution of food fishes.—An increase of \$181,632 above the amount in the current year base is recommended by the committee thus providing total funds of \$2,107,809 for this activity. The increase for 1952 is mostly for the operation of new and expanded hatcheries.

Mammal and bird reservations.—The committee recommends \$1,837,763 as requested in the budget. This is an increase of \$168,250 above the amount in the current year base. These funds are to finance refuges for the conservation of migratory water fowl and the preservation of rare birds and mammals.

River basin studies.—The committee recommends that the budget estimate of \$263,442 be approved. This is an increase of \$49,382 above the 1951 amount. This activity includes studies and surveys of areas affected by proposed Federal projects.

Control of predatory animals and injurious rodents.—The budget estimate of \$939,199, representing a decrease of \$12,328 below the current year sum, is approved by the committee.

Soil and moisture conservation.—The committee recommends approval of \$97,151 as requested in the budget for this activity. This is the same amount that was available during the current fiscal year.

INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

Research on fish and fisheries.—The budget estimate of \$1,990,971 is recommended for approval, and represents an increase of \$141,598 above the current year base amount. The increase is to provide for expanding the West Coast Pilchard Fishery investigations and to cover investigations authorized by new legislation.

Exploration, development, and utilization of fishery resources.—The committee recommends approval of \$1,580,330 as recommended in the budget. This will provide an increase of \$86,650 above the base amount available for the current fiscal year. The increase approved is for expanding the program, based for the most part on new legislation.

Research on birds and mammals.—An increase is recommended in the amount of \$11,750 above the sum available for the current year, thus providing an appropriation of \$474,699 for 1952. This activity includes studies for administering the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and cooperation with States and Universities to give technical training in wildlife management.

CONSTRUCTION

The budget estimate of \$750,000 has been approved by the committee. This amount compares with an appropriation of \$1,858,450 for the current year as reduced under section 1214.

Fish facilities.—The estimate of \$546,150 is approved. This compares with \$1,567,500 available during 1951. Projects approved for 1952 include the continuation at a reduced rate of the program, initiated in 1950, for the construction and improvement of fish hatcheries, construction of a patrol boat, and certain other minor construction.

Wildlife facilities.—A sum of \$203,850 is approved for this activity as compared with \$290,950 available during the current year. The sum recommended will provide for the continuation of construction of water control structures at lower Klamath Refuge in California and construction in Alaska to facilitate law enforcement operations.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

An appropriation of \$882,000 representing a decrease of \$30,500 below the amount available for the current year is recommended by the committee.

FEDERAL AID IN FISH RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT

The budget proposes and the committee has approved the proposed appropriation on a continuing indefinite basis of amounts equal to the 10% excise tax imposed on fishing rods, creels, reels, and artificial lures, baits, and flies to carry out the purposes of the Act of August 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 430). This act authorizes assistance to the states, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands in restoring fish and in working out better methods of fish management.

ADMINISTRATION OF PRIBILOF ISLANDS

The budget proposed a new continuing indefinite appropriation pursuant to the act approved September 27, 1950 (64 Stat. 1071). The Act authorizes the appropriation of an amount not exceeding the total proceeds of sales of furs, sealskins, and other produces of the wildlife resources of the Pribilof Islands during the preceding fiscal year. The committee has approved this appropriation on an annual indefinite basis but not on a permanent basis as requested.

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

For the various activities under the Office of Territories the committee has recommended appropriations totaling \$39,620,000. This constitutes a decrease of \$7,980,000 below the budget estimates and represents a decrease of \$34,258,180 below the amount available for the current fiscal year.

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

The budget estimate of \$9,100,000 has been reduced by \$2,080,000 and an appropriation of \$7,020,000 is recommended.

Territory of Alaska.—The estimate of \$598,281 including expenses of the Governor's Office and care and custody of Alaskan insane is approved as submitted. The principal part of the increase of \$48,000 above the base amount for the same purposes in 1951 is attributable to increased costs of care and custody of Alaskan insane.

Territory of Hawaii.—The budget request of \$40,700 is approved. This activity provides for the salary of the Governor and expenses of his office.

Virgin Islands.—An allotment of \$1,079,085 is approved, as requested. This is an increase of \$6,000 above the sum available during the current fiscal year. This item includes governmental expenses and contributes to the provision of public services. Federal assistance will be productive of maximum benefit to the Islands only if the local people do everything possible to help themselves.

Guam.—The estimate of \$253,110 for Guam has been reduced by \$20,000, providing \$150,000 for expenses under sec. 26 (c) of the Guam Organic Act, \$59,800 for the Governor's office, and \$23,310 for legislative expenses.

American Samoa.—An agreement between the Navy and Interior Departments and approved by the President provides for transfer from the Navy to the Interior Department of the administration of American Samoa at the beginning of the fiscal year 1952. The budget program presented by the Interior Department would provide for the salary and expenses of the Governor's office, the legislature, the judiciary, and certain public services. The total estimate for this budget program was \$840,000. The committee has approved \$600,000 representing a reduction of \$240,000 in the amount requested. No satisfactory explanation was presented to the committee to warrant the expenditures requested for American Samoa.

Trust Territory.—As in the case of American Samoa, the President has approved the transfer of the administration of the trust territory of the Pacific Islands to the Interior Department from the Navy Department. The budget program submitted for the trust territory in the amount of \$5,980,000 covers salaries and expenses of the office of the High Commissioner, salaries and expenses of the judiciary, and public services. The committee has approved \$4,180,000, since a program of such magnitude has not been fully justified.

General Administration.—The 1952 estimate for general administrative expenses of the Office of Territories was \$308,824, which is \$21,190 more than the amount available for the current year. The committee has noted a deficiency on the part of this office with respect to working out well-conceived programs and budgets for the activities it seeks to administer. Clearly defined policies and well considered objectives seem not to have been forthcoming with respect to the territories of the United States. The committee has approved \$288,824 for general administration, thus keeping the funds for this activity at approximately the current year level.

ALASKA PUBLIC WORKS

The Alaska public works program was transferred from the General Services Administration to the Interior Department under reorganization plan No. 15 of 1950. The program proposed for 1952 contem-

plated the letting of construction contracts amounting to \$9,500,000 for approximately 31 projects. However, no information was furnished to the committee as to which projects were definitely planned for construction under the budget estimate of \$10,000,000 for 1952. The committee recommends an appropriation of \$7,000,000, to be available only for projects which were indicated to the committee as approved under the basic act and by the local communities for their portion of the recoverable expenditures.

ALASKA ROAD COMMISSION

Construction.—An estimate of \$21,700,000 was presented for construction of roads in Alaska, as compared with \$27,400,000 available for the current fiscal year. The committee has approved \$20,000,000, which includes \$8,000,000 for liquidation of obligations under contract authority previously granted. The sum approved also includes \$100,000 to initiate construction on a 131 mile road to connect Cordova, Alaska, which is located on Prince William Sound, with the Richardson Highway. Cordova is a year-around ice-free port, and it is believed that the addition of another highway connection is important in the defense of Alaska. The approved program will provide for continuation of work on the asphalt surfacing of major roads, for improvement work on certain roads, and for construction of a road of high military priority connecting the military airport at Naknek with the ship port. Other new construction and reconstruction work will be carried out.

A provision has been placed in the bill limiting the amount of funds that can be expended under force account or hired labor, since testimony indicates there is adequate bidding by contractors in Alaska to insure competition and protection of the Government's interest.

Operation and maintenance.—An appropriation of \$2,600,000, equal to that available for the current year, is recommended. This represents a reduction of \$700,000 below the amount requested in the budget.

There are reports of overloads being permitted on Alaska highways, necessitating high maintenance costs. To the extent that such is increasing the need for greater maintenance appropriations, immediate corrective action should be taken. If the military services are indulging in such practices, military appropriations should be drawn upon for any resulting high maintenance costs, and such practices by private operators should be prohibited.

CONSTRUCTION, ALASKA RAILROAD

An estimate of \$2,500,000 was submitted for completion of the rehabilitation program of the railroad, for the acquisition of boats and barges, and for certain repairs and improvements to marine and other facilities. The estimate has been reduced by \$500,000, and an appropriation of \$2,000,000 is recommended to cover all of the items included in the budget. To the extent that such appropriation may be inadequate, the program should be reduced. The committee does not intend that additional appropriations be provided for the rehabilitation program, and does not intend to support an endless

program of additional capital investment in the Alaska Railroad. Realistic long-range objectives to accomplish well-defined transportation needs will have to be worked out before estimates for additional capital expenditures will be considered, and any proposed capital expenditures from appropriated funds will be carefully reviewed in the light of their self-liquidating possibilities.

VIRGIN ISLANDS PUBLIC WORKS

The estimate of \$1,000,000 for the Virgin Islands public works program is approved. The facilities most critically needed are hospitals and schools and the committee is at a loss to account for the failure of the Department to give such facilities a priority higher than has been given other construction obviously of less urgency. The full budget estimate is approved with the understanding that no part of the appropriation is to be used for the waterfront development project on St. Thomas. Funds included in the budget for this project are to be available for school and hospital facilities. Plans should be developed for the construction of a high school on St. Thomas on a basis that will provide adequate training of students for the type of work which will be available to them on the island. Also hospitals must be planned and constructed in the light of the need for hospital facilities rather than on a scale which will not meet the existing needs. With the appropriation recommended, and an unused obligational authority in the amount of \$1,467,000, an amount sufficient to provide adequate schools and hospitals should be available.

ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

For salaries and expenses of the Office of the Secretary the committee recommends approval of the budget estimate of \$2,365,000. This amount represents an increase of \$75,000 above the appropriation base for 1951. Of the increase, \$50,000 is provided to finance in part the cost of establishing the offices of two new assistant secretaries as authorized by Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1950. Other than the positions involved in these two additional offices, the action of the committee does not provide for any new positions under this appropriation.

Several major adjustments have been made in the organization of the Office of the Secretary following approval by Congress of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1950. One of the major changes has been the alignment of bureaus reporting to each Assistant Secretary. While the purpose of such an arrangement may be desirable from the viewpoint of integrating the work of the Department, there is real danger in an Assistant Secretary exercising more control than is necessary to achieve the objective of the alignment. While the Secretary may be compelled to delegate much of his authority to subordinates because of the size of the Department and the scope of its activities, he should keep a close watch on operations and administrative decisions under such delegations in order to insure that they are being conducted within the limits of established policies.

VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

The 1952 budget program of the corporation includes the production and sale of sugar, development of tourist trade, water and soil con-

servation, agricultural diversification and marketing, industrial and commercial development, and a power program. The committee is in agreement with these proposed activities except for the power program, and except that on St. Croix more emphasis should be placed upon the agricultural diversification and soil and moisture conservation development with less emphasis on the development of tourist trade. The latter can be left more to private initiative, while agricultural diversification and water conservation programs require expenditures not necessarily productive of immediate cash returns.

Commendable progress has been made in putting the cane and sugar operations on a profitable basis.

The amended estimate of \$2,595,000 for additions to the revolving fund has been reduced by \$795,000 and \$1,800,000 has been approved. The funds requested for proposed capital expenditures for buildings and land improvements, including agricultural housing, wells, and agricultural machinery and equipment, are approved; and additional operating capital is also recommended by the committee. The latter is not to be available for capital expenditures unless expressly budgeted in advance and approved by Congress therefor.

Clearing land for use as pasture, together with water conservation programs, will make possible a profitable expansion of stock raising on St. Croix, and should be beneficial to the economy of the islands.

The proposal to purchase, maintain, and operate the power facilities on St. Croix is not approved. It is understood that it might be possible for funds to be obtained from the Rural Electrification Administration to better advantage for carrying out this activity than could be realized under the plans submitted for the corporation. If that is incorrect, and if the plan of the corporation is more advantageous it should be presented by officials of the corporation in a manner to so demonstrate.

The estimates for grants and for administrative expenses are approved as submitted.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The committee has not approved the provision requested under which appropriations to other bureaus can finance technical advice to territories. Such functions should be budgeted for in the regular manner.

The provision requested to authorize the purchase and use of aircraft and ships by the Office of Territories is not approved. Such legislative authorization should be sought in the regular manner.

A new provision has been included in the bill limiting the use of appropriations for paying excessive compensation to persons outside the continental United States.

LIMITATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore included in connection with any appropriation bill are recommended:

On pages 16 and 17, in connection with operation and maintenance, Bureau of Reclamation:

Provided further, That after December 31, 1951, no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for payment of the cost of operation and maintenance of Imperial Dam and the All-American Canal and appurtenant works to and

including Pilot Knob check and wasteway (engineer station 1098) for the purpose of diversion or carriage of water for any water user, district, or association unless and until arrangements, satisfactory to the Secretary, shall have been made for payment annually to the United States of the part of such cost allocable to such water user, district, or association.

On page 22, in connection with administrative provisions, Bureau of Reclamation:

Not to exceed \$1,684,000 of the appropriation herein made for "Construction and rehabilitation, Bureau of Reclamation" shall be available for expenditure toward completion of construction of the Coachella division of the All-American Canal system, Boulder Canyon project: Provided, That prior thereto contractual arrangements satisfactory to the Secretary shall be made for repayment of sums so expended in excess of the amount required to be repaid under the existing contract between the Coachella County Water District and the United States.

On page 31, in connection with the Fish and Wildlife Service:

FEDERAL AID IN FISH RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 9, 1950 (Public Law 681), amounts equal to the revenues described in section 3 of said Act and credited during the next preceding fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, to remain available until expended.

On page 34, in connection with administrative provisions for Construction of Roads, Alaska:

Not to exceed 25 per centum of the amount herein appropriated for construction of roads in Alaska shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired labor basis.

On page 39, under General Provisions, Department of the Interior:

SEC. 112. No part of the funds made available by this Act may be used to compensate any person for employment in the Federal service outside the continental limits of the United States at a rate higher than is paid for comparable work in the Federal service within the continental limits of the United States, other than a person who was a resident citizen of the continental United States at the date of his appointment to a position outside the continental limits of the United States and has had continuous employment in the Federal service (except as interrupted by service in the Armed Forces of the United States) from the date of such appointment.

COMPLIANCE WITH CLAUSE 2 (A) OF RULE XIII

PENDING BILL

On page 3, lines 5 through 18:

CONTINUING FUND, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy under the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), generated or purchased in the southeastern power area, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, except that the Treasury shall set up and maintain from such receipts a continuing fund of \$50,000, and said fund shall be placed to the credit of the Secretary, and shall be subject to check by him to defray emergency expenses necessary to insure continuity of electric service and continuous operation of Government facilities in said area.

EXISTING LAW

*SEC. 5. * * * All moneys received from such sales shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. (Act approved Dec. 22, 1944, 16 U. S. C. 825s.)*

PENDING BILL

EXISTING LAW

SEC. 4. (a) Effective July 1, 1935, all receipts of the character theretofore credited to the appropriation accounts appearing on the books of the Government and listed in subsection (b) of this section shall be deposited into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, and amounts equal thereto are authorized to be appropriated annually from the general fund of the Treasury for the same purposes for which such receipts are now appropriated. Appropriations to which expenditures under such accounts have been chargeable theretofore are hereby repealed, effective on such date: *Provided*, That if the total of receipts for any one fiscal year for any of the foregoing purposes under this authority is greater than the amounts appropriated for such purpose, such excess is authorized to be appropriated for the following fiscal year.

(b) * * *

On page 8, lines 3 through 13:

PAYMENTS TO STATES (PROCEEDS OF SALES)

For payment to the several States of 5 per centum of the net proceeds of sales of public lands and materials lying within their limits, for the purpose of education or of making public roads and improvements, sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received in accordance with section 4 of the Act of June 26, 1934 (31 U. S. C. 725c), during the current and succeeding fiscal years, and including in the fiscal year 1952 the unappropriated balance of receipts of prior fiscal years, to remain available until expended.

(Continuation of Sec. 4 (b), above) subsection (34): Five Percent Funds to States * * *.

On page 8, lines 14 through 24:

PAYMENT TO OKLAHOMA (ROYALTIES)

For payment to the State of Oklahoma in lieu of all State and local taxes upon tribal funds accruing under the provisions of the joint resolution of June 12, 1926 (44 Stat. 740), to be expended by the State in the same manner as if received under section 35 of the Act approved February 25, 1920 (30 U. S. C. 191), sums equal to 37½ per centum of the royalties received during the current and each succeeding fiscal year, from the south half of Red River in Oklahoma under the provisions of said joint resolution of June 12, 1926, to remain available until expended.

(Continuation of Sec. 4 (b), above) subsection (4): Payment to Oklahoma from royalties, oil and gas, south half of Red River * * *.

PENDING BILL

EXISTING LAW

On page 12, lines 23 through 25 and
on page 13, lines 1 through 6:

PROCEEDS FROM POWER

Sums not in excess of the amount of power revenues covered into the Treasury during the current and each succeeding fiscal year to the credit of each of the power projects, including revenues credited prior to August 7, 1946, to remain available until expended for the purposes authorized by section 3 of the Act of August 7, 1946, as amended (31 U. S. C. 725s-3), in connection with the respective projects from which such revenues are derived.

(Continuation of Sec. 4 (b), above) subsection (13): Maintenance, irrigation system (name of project), Act August 1, 1914.

(Continuation of Sec. 4 (b), above) subsection (14): Maintenance, irrigation system (name of project), Act May 18, 1916.

(Continuation of Sec. 4 (b), above) subsection (15): Maintenance, power system, Flathead Reservation, Montana, Act May 10, 1926 * * *.

(Continuation of Sec. 4 (b), above) subsection (16): Power plant, Coolidge Dam, Arizona, electric current fund, Act March 7, 1928 * * * (Act of June 26, 1934, 31 U. S. C. 725c).

SEC. 3. Revenues hereafter collected from power operations on each Indian irrigation project and deposited into the Treasury for credit to miscellaneous receipts pursuant to section 4 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934 (48 Stat. 1227), or pursuant to other provisions of law, are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, in specific or in indefinite amounts, equal to the collections so credited, for the following purposes in connection with the respective projects from which such revenues are derived * * * (Act of August 7, 1946, 31 U. S. C. 725s-3).

On page 9, lines 8 through 16:

PAYMENTS TO STATES (GRAZING FEES)

Sums not in excess of 33½ per centum of all grazing fees received during the current and each succeeding fiscal year from each grazing district on Indian lands ceded to the United States for disposition under the public-land laws, to remain available until expended for payment to the State in which said lands are situated, in accordance with the provisions of section 11 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C. 315j).

When appropriated by Congress, 33½ per centum of all grazing fees received from each grazing district on Indian lands ceded to the United States for disposition under the public-land laws during any fiscal year shall be paid at the end thereof by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State in which said lands are situated, to be expended as the State legislature may prescribe for the benefit of public schools and public roads of the county or counties in which such grazing lands are situated. * * * (Act of June 28, 1934, as amended, 43 U. S. C. 315j).

PENDING BILL

EXISTING LAW

On page 9, lines 1 through 7:

LEASING OF GRAZING LANDS

For leasing State, county, or privately owned lands in accordance with the provisions of the Act of June 23, 1938 (43 U. S. C. 315m-1), sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received during the current and each succeeding fiscal year, in accordance with the Act of June 23, 1938 (43 U. S. C. 315m-4), to remain available until expended.

On page 12, lines 17 through 22.

CLAIMS AND TREATY OBLIGATIONS

For fulfilling treaties with Senecas and Six Nations of New York, Choctaws and Pawnees of Oklahoma, and payment to Indians of Sioux reservations, to be expended as provided by law, such amounts as may be necessary after June 30, 1951.

On page 35, line 23, and on page 36, lines 1 and 2:

Provided, That the estimated project costs specified in said Act of December 20, 1944, shall not constitute limitations on amounts that may be expended for such projects.

All moneys received by the Secretary of the Interior in the administration of leased lands as provided in section 315m-2 of this title shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, but are hereby made available, when appropriated by the Congress, for the leasing of lands under sections 315m-1 to 315m-4 of this title and shall not be distributed as provided under sections 315i and 315j of this title. (Act of June 23, 1938, 43 U. S. C. 315m-4.)

SEC. 2. (a) Effective July 1, 1935, the permanent appropriations under the appropriation titles listed in subsection (b) of this section are repealed, and such portions of any Acts as make permanent appropriations to be expended under such accounts are amended so as to authorize, in lieu thereof, annual appropriations from the general fund of the Treasury in identical terms and in such amounts as now provided by the laws providing such permanent appropriations, * * *.

(b) (2) Civilization of the Sioux * * *. (Act of June 26, 1934, as amended, 31 U. S. C. 725a.)

* * * the Federal Works Administrator * * * is authorized to provide or undertake the following useful projects * * * at the respective estimated costs indicated: *Provided*, That where found necessary by the Administrator, the funds authorized herein shall be available for the augmentation of limits of cost of projects in an amount not exceeding 25 per centum for any project * * *. (Sec. 1 of Public Law 510, approved December 20, 1944.)

PERMANENT AND INDEFINITE APPROPRIATIONS, GENERAL AND SPECIAL FUNDS

	Appropriated, 1951	Estimated, 1952	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
Continuing fund, Southeastern Power Administration.....	-----	\$50, 000	+ \$50, 000
Continuing fund, Southwestern Power Administration.....	\$63, 000	198, 000	+ 135, 000
Replacement of personal property sold.....	272, 000	244, 000	— 28, 000
Continuing fund for emergency expenses, Bonneville power project.....	147, 000	-----	— 147, 000
Range improvements.....	350, 000	360, 000	+ 10, 000
Payments to States (proceeds of sales).....	20, 000	75, 000	+ 55, 000
Payment of royalties to Oklahoma.....	4, 125	4, 000	— 125
Leasing of grazing lands.....	6, 000	6, 000	-----
Payments to States (grazing fees).....	188	200	+ 12
Oregon and California grant lands, deficiency payments to counties in lieu of taxes.....	543, 737	900, 000	+ 356, 263
Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, excess payments.....	10, 000	10, 000	-----
Oregon and California grant lands, excess payments.....	10, 000	10, 000	-----
Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, payments to Coos and Douglas Counties, Oregon, in lieu of taxes.....	285, 182	350, 000	+ 64, 818
Oregon and California grant lands, payments to counties.....	1, 812, 457	3, 750, 000	+ 1, 937, 543
Payments to States from grazing receipts, public lands.....	358, 588	381, 400	+ 22, 812
Mineral Leasing Act, payments to States.....	12, 000, 000	14, 700, 000	+ 2, 700, 000
Alaska school lands, payment to Alaska.....	750	750	-----

Claim and treaty obligations, Indian affairs-----	151, 020	151, 020	-----
Power revenues, Indian irrigation projects-----	1, 500, 000	1, 500, 000	-----
Acquisition of lands and loans to Indians in Oklahoma, Act of June 26, 1936-----	10, 395	500	-9, 895
Indian arts and crafts fund-----	200	200	-----
Payments to States of Arizona and Nevada-----	600, 000	600, 000	-----
Repayment of advances from Treasury-----	4, 500, 000	4, 500, 000	-----
Continuing fund, emergency expenses, Fort Peck project, Montana-----	402, 086	400, 000	-2, 086
Payments from proceeds of sale of water, Geological Survey-----	800	800	-----
Development and operation of helium properties, Bureau of Mines-----	435, 000	435, 000	-----
Educational expenses, children of employees, Yellowstone National Park-----	20, 428	18, 603	-1, 825
Migratory bird conservation fund-----	3, 800, 000	3, 800, 000	-----
Federal aid in wildlife restoration-----	9, 351, 614	8, 000, 000	-1, 351, 614
Federal aid in fish restoration and management-----	-----	3, 000, 000	+3, 000, 000
Management of national wildlife refuges-----	324, 899	300, 000	-24, 899
Administration of Pribilof Islands-----	-----	1, 614, 000	+1, 614, 000
Expenses, incident to sale of refuge products-----	32, 000	32, 000	-----
Payments to counties under Migratory Bird Conservation Act-----	108, 300	100, 000	-8, 300
Alaska Railroad fund-----	14, 500, 000	15, 000, 000	+500, 000
Total, general and special funds-----	51, 619, 769	60, 491, 473	+8, 871, 704

TRUST FUND APPROPRIATIONS

(Not a charge against revenue)

	Appropriated, 1951	Estimated, 1952	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
Construction of electric transmission lines and substations, contributions, Bonneville power project-----	\$26, 628	-----	-\$26, 628
Deposits by individuals for surveying public lands-----	16, 750	\$16, 750	-----
Administration and protection of grazing districts-----	50, 000	50, 000	-----
Miscellaneous trust funds, Bureau of Land Management-----	2, 005, 000	2, 005, 000	-----
Alaska town-site funds-----	1, 000	1, 000	-----
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor-----	1, 250, 000	1, 250, 000	-----
Miscellaneous trust funds of Indian tribes-----	55, 000, 000	12, 000, 000	-43, 000, 000
Operation and maintenance collections, Indian irrigation projects-----	1, 500, 000	1, 500, 000	-----
Advances by States, etc., for construction, operation, and maintenance of reclamation projects, including investigations-----	220, 000	1, 015, 000	+795, 000
Synthetic liquid fuels program, cooperative fund-----	13, 000	-----	-13, 000
Metallurgical research and pilot plants contributions, Bureau of Mines-----	7, 500	-----	-7, 500
Donations, including land, national parks-----	20, 000	20, 000	-----
Gifts or bequests of personal property, national parks-----	11, 000	8, 700	-2, 300

Birthplace of Abraham Lincoln, preservation of, national parks-----	1, 535	1, 585	-----
Expenses, fur seal and fox industries, Pribilof Islands-----	30, 000	-----	--30, 000
Fox and fur seal industries-----	140, 632	-----	--140, 632
Miscellaneous contributed funds, Fish and Wildlife Service-----	100, 000	100, 000	-----
Improvement of roads, bridges, and trails, Alaska-----	230, 000	220, 000	--10, 000
Total, appropriations, trust funds-----	60, 623, 095	18, 188, 035	--42, 435, 060
Total, permanent and indefinite appropriations, including trust funds-----	112, 242, 864	78, 679, 508	--33, 563, 356

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1951, AMOUNTS AS REDUCED UNDER SEC. 1214
(GENERAL REDUCTION OF \$550,000,000 IN GENERAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1951), ESTIMATES FOR 1952
AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1952

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Budget estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214			1951 as reduced under sec. 1214	1952 estimate
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY						
Connally Hot Oil Act, enforcement of—	\$180,000	\$180,000	\$174,000	\$174,000	—\$6,000	-----
Power and energy studies, New England and New York-----			35,000			—\$35,000
Working capital fund-----	300,000	300,000			—300,000	-----
Southeastern Power Administration:						
Construction-----	¹ 1,850,000	¹ 1,850,000	4,000,000	3,400,000	+1,550,000	—600,000
Operation and maintenance-----	150,000	150,000	300,000	275,000	+125,000	—25,000
Continuing fund-----			⁽²⁾	⁽²⁾		-----
Southwestern Power Administration:						
Construction-----	³ 8,620,000	³ 8,620,000	4,100,000	3,925,000	—4,695,000	—175,000
Operation and maintenance-----	760,000	760,000	1,300,000	1,275,000	+515,000	—25,000
Standardization of geographic names-----	⁶ 2,500	⁶ 2,500			2,500	-----
Total, Office of the Secretary-----	11,862,500	11,862,500	9,909,000	9,049,000	—2,813,500	—860,000
Commission of Fine Arts-----	12,530	12,530	7,270,000	20,000	+7,470	—7,000

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION					
Construction-----	\$ 40, 950, 000	\$ 40, 950, 000	69, 500, 000	67, 500, 000	+ 26, 550, 000
Operation and maintenance-----	5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	5, 500, 000	5, 250, 000	+ 250, 000
Total, Bonneville Power Administration-----	45, 950, 000	45, 950, 000	75, 000, 000	72, 750, 000	+ 26, 800, 000
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT					
Management of lands and resources-----	7, 127, 810	6, 927, 810	7, 850, 000	7, 700, 000	+ 772, 190
Construction-----	700, 000	650, 000	1, 000, 000	-----	- 650, 000
Range improvements-----	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	-----
Payments to States (proceeds of sales) -	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	-----
Payment of royalties to Oklahoma-----	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	-----
Leasing of grazing lands-----	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	-----
Payments to States (grazing fees) -----	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	-----
Total, Bureau of Land Management-----	7, 827, 810	7, 577, 810	8, 850, 000	7, 700, 000	+ 122, 190
					- 1, 150, 000

¹ Appropriated in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.² Continuing fund financed from power and energy receipts.³ And \$1,730,000 contract authority.⁴ Excludes \$427,300 for activities transferred in the estimates to "Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration."⁵ Includes \$427,300 for activities previously carried under "Construction, Southwestern Power Administration."⁶ Represents a temporary appropriation under Public Law 585, of June 29, 1950.⁷ Includes \$9,000 in H. Doc. 66.⁸ And \$20,000,000 contract authority.⁹ Indefinite appropriation of receipts. Includes \$1,450,000 appropriated in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, amounts as reduced under sec. 1214 (general reduction of \$550,000,000 in General Appropriation Act, 1951), estimates for 1952 and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Budget estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214			1951, as reduced under sec. 1214	1952 estimate
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS						
Health, education and welfare services	¹⁰ \$40,332,328	¹⁰ \$39,732,328	\$43,600,000			
Resources management	10,814,576	10,614,576	11,400,000			
Construction	¹¹ 23,477,651	¹¹ 19,137,651	12,000,000			
General administrative expenses	3,600,000	3,580,000	3,600,000			
Revolving fund for loans	2,400,000	2,400,000	800,000			
Payment to Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations	10,500	10,500	25,000			
Claims and treaty obligations	(¹²)	(¹²)	(¹²)			
Operation and maintenance, power systems, Indian irrigation projects	(¹²)	(¹²)	(¹²)			
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs, exclusive of tribal funds	80,635,055	75,475,055	71,425,000	65,000,000	-10,475,055	-6,425,000
Tribal funds (not included in totals of this tabulation)	¹³ 2,437,965	¹³ 2,437,965	¹³ 2,075,000	¹³ 2,080,000	-357,965	+5,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION						
General investigations-----	5, 875, 000	5, 500, 000	5, 500, 000	5, 000, 000	-500, 000	-500, 000
Construction and rehabilitation-----	¹⁴ 296, 928, 000	¹⁵ 243, 733, 000	223, 690, 000	207, 190, 000	-36, 543, 000	-16, 500, 000
Operation and maintenance-----	15, 491, 000	15, 447, 000	16, 385, 000	15, 385, 000	-62, 000	-1, 000, 000
General administrative expenses-----	7, 200, 000	6, 864, 000	6, 000, 000	5, 500, 000	1, 364, 000	-500, 000
Emergency fund-----	-----	-----	500, 000	500, 000	+500, 000	-----
Total, Bureau of Reclamation-----	325, 494, 000	271, 544, 000	252, 075, 000	233, 575, 000	-37, 969, 000	-18, 500, 000
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY						
Surveys, investigations, and research-----	19, 382, 000	18, 882, 000	22, 900, 000	22, 900, 000	+4, 018, 000	-----
BUREAU OF MINES						
Conservation and development of mineral resources-----	¹⁶ 18, 008, 000	¹⁶ 17, 658, 000	¹⁷ 18, 700, 000	17, 950, 000	+292, 000	-750, 000
Health and safety-----	3, 805, 000	3, 805, 000	3, 790, 000	3, 790, 000	-15, 000	-----
Construction-----	¹⁸ 1, 868, 100	¹⁸ 1, 868, 100	1, 250, 000	1, 250, 000	-618, 100	-----
General administrative expenses-----	1, 300, 000	1, 290, 000	1, 290, 000	1, 290, 000	-----	-----
Total, Bureau of Mines-----	24, 981, 100	24, 621, 100	25, 030, 000	24, 280, 000	-341, 100	-750, 000

¹⁰ Includes \$80,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.¹¹ Includes \$205,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951. Also \$3,500,000 contract authority.¹² Indefinite appropriation.¹³ In addition to funds otherwise made available.¹⁴ Includes \$1,100,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951. Also \$3,000,000 contract authority.¹⁵ Includes \$1,100,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.¹⁶ Includes \$250,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.¹⁷ Includes \$750,000 in H. Doc. 66.¹⁸ Includes \$600,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, amounts as reduced under sec. 1214 (general reduction of \$550,000,000 in General Appropriation Act, 1951), estimates for 1952 and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Budget estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214			1951, as reduced under sec. 1214	1952 estimate
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE						
Management and protection-----	¹⁰ \$7, 728, 700	¹⁹ \$7, 578, 700	²⁰ \$8, 176, 000	\$7, 735, 000	+\$156, 300	—\$441, 000
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities-----	7, 400, 000	7, 200, 000	²¹ 7, 396, 500	7, 300, 000	+ 100, 000	—96, 500
Construction-----	²² 19, 667, 500	²² 16, 467, 500	11, 975, 000	11, 975, 000	—4, 492, 500	-----
General administrative expenses-----	1, 314, 500	1, 294, 500	1, 284, 500	1, 284, 500	— 10, 000	-----
Total, National Park Service-----	36, 110, 700	32, 540, 700	28, 832, 000	28, 294, 500	—4, 246, 200	—537, 500
FISH AND WILDLIFE						
Management of resources-----	7, 082, 000	6, 932, 000	6, 870, 000	6, 870, 000	—62, 000	-----
Investigations of resources-----	4, 125, 000	3, 875, 000	4, 046, 000	4, 046, 000	+ 171, 000	-----
Construction-----	²³ 2, 533, 450	²³ 1, 858, 450	750, 000	750, 000	—1, 108, 450	-----
General administrative expenses-----	917, 500	912, 500	882, 000	882, 000	—30, 500	-----
Federal aid, in fish restoration and management-----	-----	-----	(²⁴)	(²⁴)	-----	-----
Administration of Pribilof Islands-----	-----	-----	(²⁴)	(²⁴)	-----	-----
Total, Fish and Wildlife Service-----	14, 657, 950	13, 577, 950	12, 548, 000	12, 548, 000	—1, 029, 950	-----

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES						
Administration of Territories-----	25 3, 428, 180	25 3, 378, 180	9, 100, 000	7, 020, 000	+ 3, 641, 820	- 2, 080, 000
Alaska public works-----	9, 000, 000	8, 000, 000	10, 000, 000	7, 000, 000	- 1, 000, 000	- 3, 000, 000
Construction of roads, Alaska-----	26 27, 900, 000	26 27, 400, 000	21, 700, 000	20, 000, 000	- 7, 400, 000	- 1, 700, 000
Operation and maintenance of roads, Alaska-----	2, 600, 000	2, 600, 000	3, 300, 000	2, 600, 000	-----	- 700, 000
Construction, Alaska Railroad-----	27 31, 500, 000	27 31, 500, 000	2, 500, 000	2, 000, 000	- 29, 500, 000	- 500, 000
Virgin Islands public works-----	28 1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	-----	-----
Total, Office of Territories-----	75, 428, 180	73, 878, 180	47, 600, 000	39, 620, 000	- 34, 258, 180	- 7, 980, 000
Administration, Department of the Interior-----	2, 315, 000	2, 290, 000	2, 365, 000	2, 365, 000	+ 75, 000	-----
Subtotal, Department of the Interior-----	644, 656, 825	578, 211, 825	556, 561, 000	518, 101, 500	- 60, 110, 325	- 38, 459, 500

¹⁹ Includes \$40,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.

²⁰ Includes \$70,354 for activities previously carried under "Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities, National Park Service."

²¹ Excludes \$70,354 transferred in the estimates to "Management and protection, National Park Service."

²² Includes \$500 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.

²³ Includes \$110,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.

²⁴ Indefinite appropriation of receipts.

²⁵ Includes \$36,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.

²⁶ Includes \$7,500,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.

²⁷ Includes \$1,500,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.

²⁸ And \$1,467,000 contract authority.

Also \$8,000,000 contract authority.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, amounts as reduced under sec. 1214 (general reduction of \$550,000,000 in General Appropriation Act, 1951), estimates for 1952 and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Budget estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214			1951, as reduced under sec. 1214	1952 estimate
VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION						
Revolving fund-----			2 ⁹ \$2, 595, 000	\$1, 800, 000	+\$1, 800, 000	—\$795, 000
Grants-----	\$474, 000	\$474, 000	130, 000	130, 000	—344, 000	-----
Administrative expenses ³⁰ -----	121, 480	121, 480	130, 000	130, 000	+8, 520	-----
Total, Virgin Islands Corpora- tion-----	474, 000	474, 000	2, 725, 000	1, 930, 000	+1, 456, 000	—795, 000
Grand total, Department of the Interior-----	645, 130, 825	578, 685, 825	559, 286, 000	520, 031, 500	—58, 654, 325	—39, 254, 500

²⁹ Decreased from \$3,285,000 in H. Doc. 66.

³⁰ Corporate funds—not included in totals of this tabulation.

○

Union Calendar No. 91

82^D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3790

[Report No. 339]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 20, 1951

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

A BILL

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

4 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
5 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-
6 ment of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30,
7 1952, namely:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

ENFORCEMENT OF CONNALLY HOT OIL ACT

For expenses necessary for controlling the interstate shipment of contraband oil as required by law (15 U. S. C. 715), including purchase of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, \$174,000.

CONSTRUCTION, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, \$3,400,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER

ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, \$275,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations of the Southeastern Power Administration shall be available for purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles. Appropriations made herein to

1 the Southeastern Power Administration shall be available
2 in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for
3 operation and maintenance shall be available only for the
4 service of the current fiscal year.

5 CONTINUING FUND, SOUTHEASTERN POWER

6 ADMINISTRATION

7 All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric
8 power and energy under the provisions of section 5 of the
9 Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (16 U. S. C.
10 825s), generated or purchased in the southeastern power
11 area, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States
12 as miscellaneous receipts, except that the Treasury shall
13 set up and maintain from such receipts a continuing fund of
14 \$50,000, and said fund shall be placed to the credit of the
15 Secretary, and shall be subject to check by him to defray
16 emergency expenses necessary to insure continuity of electric
17 service and continuous operation of Government facilities in
18 said area.

19 CONSTRUCTION, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

20 For construction and acquisition of transmission lines,
21 substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administra-
22 tive expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the pro-
23 visions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16
24 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area,

1 to remain available until expended, \$3,925,000, of which
2 not to exceed \$600,000 is for liquidation of obligations in-
3 curred pursuant to authority previously granted.

4 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER
5 ADMINISTRATION

6 For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance
7 of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric
8 power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5
9 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as
10 applied to the southwestern power area, \$1,275,000.

11 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

12 Appropriations of the Southwestern Power Administra-
13 tion shall be available for purchase of not to exceed fifteen
14 passenger motor vehicles, of which eight shall be for re-
15 placement only. Appropriations made herein to the South-
16 western Power Administration shall be available in one fund,
17 except that the appropriation herein made for operation and
18 maintenance shall be available only for the service of the
19 current fiscal year.

20 TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FACILITIES, DENISON DAM PROJECT

21 The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to
22 transfer to the Secretary of the Interior under arrangements
23 satisfactory to said Secretaries, without exchange of funds,
24 all right, title, and interest, including rights-of-way, of the

1 Department of the Army in and to the Denison-Payne 132-
2 kilovolt transmission line.

3 COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For expenses made necessary by the Act establishing
6 a Commission of Fine Arts (40 U. S. C. 104), including
7 payment of actual traveling expenses of the members and
8 secretary of the Commission in attending meetings and
9 committee meetings of the Commission either within or out-
10 side the District of Columbia, to be disbursed on vouchers
11 approved by the Commission, \$20,000.

12 BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

13 CONSTRUCTION

14 For construction and acquisition of transmission lines,
15 substations, and appurtenant facilities, as authorized by law,
16 to remain available until expended, \$67,500,000, of which
17 not to exceed \$21,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations
18 incurred pursuant to authority previously granted.

19 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

20 For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance
21 of the Bonneville transmission system and of marketing
22 electric power and energy, \$5,250,000.

23 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

24 Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administration

1 shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed upon
2 the Administrator pursuant to law, including not to exceed
3 \$40,000 for services as authorized by Section 15 of the Act
4 of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including such services
5 at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem for individuals; pur-
6 chase of not to exceed sixteen passenger motor vehicles of
7 which twelve shall be for replacement only; and purchase
8 (not to exceed two) of aircraft. Appropriations made herein
9 to the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available
10 in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for
11 operation and maintenance shall be available only for the
12 service of the current fiscal year.

13 Not to exceed 12 per centum of the appropriation for
14 construction herein made for the Bonneville Power Admin-
15 istration shall be available for construction work by force
16 account or on a hired-labor basis, except in case of emer-
17 gencies, local in character, so declared by the Bonneville
18 Power Administrator.

19 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

20 MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

21 For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement,
22 development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and
23 performance of other functions, as authorized by law, in
24 the management of lands and their resources under the
25 jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, \$7,700,000:

1 *Provided*, That this appropriation may be expended on a
2 reimbursable basis for surveys of lands other than those
3 under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

4 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

5 Appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management shall
6 be available for purchase of not to exceed thirty-two passen-
7 ger motor vehicles for replacement only; and alteration and
8 maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities
9 to which the United States has title: *Provided*, That of ap-
10 propriations herein made for the Bureau of Land Manage-
11 ment expenditures in connection with the revested Oregon
12 and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon
13 Road grant lands shall be reimbursed from the 25 per centum
14 referred to in section C, title II, of the Act approved August
15 28, 1937, of the special fund designated the "Oregon and
16 California Land Grant Fund" and section 4 of the Act ap-
17 proved May 24, 1939, of the special fund designated the
18 "Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant Fund".

19 RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

20 For construction, purchase, and maintenance of range
21 improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and
22 10 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C.
23 315), sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received,
24 during the current fiscal year, as range improvement fees
25 under section 3 of said Act and of 25 per centum of all

1 moneys received, during the current fiscal year, under sec-
2 tion 15 of said Act, to remain available until expended.

3 PAYMENTS TO STATES (PROCEEDS OF SALES)

4 For payment to the several States of 5 per centum of
5 the net proceeds of sales of public lands and materials lying
6 within their limits, for the purpose of education or of
7 making public roads and improvements, sums equal to the
8 aggregate of all moneys received in accordance with sec-
9 tion 4 of the Act of June 26, 1934 (31 U. S. C. 725c),
10 during the current and succeeding fiscal years, and includ-
11 ing in the fiscal year 1952 the unappropriated balance of
12 receipts of prior fiscal years, to remain available until
13 expended.

14 PAYMENT TO OKLAHOMA (ROYALTIES)

15 For payment to the State of Oklahoma in lieu of all
16 State and local taxes upon tribal funds accruing under the
17 provisions of the joint resolution of June 12, 1926 (44
18 Stat. 740), to be expended by the State in the same manner
19 as if received under section 35 of the Act approved February
20 25, 1920 (30 U. S. C. 191), sums equal to $37\frac{1}{2}$ per centum
21 of the royalties received during the current and each suc-
22 ceeding fiscal year, from the south half of Red River in
23 Oklahoma under the provisions of said joint resolution of
24 June 12, 1926, to remain available until expended.

LEASING OF GRAZING LANDS

For leasing State, county, or privately owned lands in accordance with the provisions of the Act of June 23, 1938 (43 U. S. C. 315m-1), sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received during the current and each succeeding fiscal year, in accordance with the Act of June 23, 1938 (43 U. S. C. 315m-4), to remain available until expended.

PAYMENTS TO STATES (GRAZING FEES)

Sums not in excess of $33\frac{1}{3}$ per centum of all grazing fees received during the current and each succeeding fiscal year from each grazing district on Indian lands ceded to the United States for disposition under the public-land laws, to remain available until expended for payment to the State in which said lands are situated, in accordance with the provisions of section 11 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C. 315j).

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, \$65,000,000, to be available in not to exceed the amounts indicated respectively for the following purposes:

Health, education, and welfare services: For expenses necessary to provide health, education, and welfare services

1 for Indians, either directly or in cooperation with States and
2 other organizations, including payment (in advance or from
3 date of admission) of care, tuition, assistance, and other
4 expenses of Indians in boarding homes, institutions, or
5 schools; grants and other assistance to needy Indians; main-
6 tenance of law and order, and payment of rewards for
7 information or evidence concerning violations of law on
8 Indian reservations or lands; and operation of Indian arts
9 and crafts shops and museums; \$43,600,000.

10 Resources management: For expenses necessary for
11 management, development, improvement, and protection of
12 resources and appurtenant facilities under the jurisdiction of
13 the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including payment of irrigation
14 assessments and charges; acquisition of water rights; con-
15 ducting agricultural experiments and demonstrations; fur-
16 nishing plants or seed to Indians; advances for Indian indus-
17 trial and business enterprises; payment of expenses of Indian
18 fairs, including premiums for exhibits; and development of
19 Indian arts and crafts as authorized by law (25 U. S. C.
20 305), including expenses of exhibits; \$11,400,000.

21 Construction: For construction, major repair, and
22 improvement of irrigation and power systems, buildings,
23 utilities, roads and trails, and other facilities; acquisi-
24 tion of lands and interests in lands; preparation of lands
25 for farming; and architectural and engineering services

1 by contract; to remain available until expended, \$12,-
2 000,000, of which not to exceed \$3,125,000 is for
3 liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority
4 previously granted: *Provided*, That no part of the sum
5 herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of
6 land within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado,
7 New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming outside of
8 the boundaries of existing Indian reservations: *Provided*
9 *further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for
10 the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of
11 Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside or outside the
12 boundaries of existing reservations.

13 General administrative expenses: For expenses neces-
14 sary for the general administration of the Bureau of
15 Indian Affairs, including such expenses in field offices,
16 \$3,600,000.

17 Revolving fund for loans: For an additional amount
18 for loans as authorized by sections 10 and 11 of the Act
19 of June 18, 1934 (25 U. S. C. 470, 471), as amended
20 and supplemented, and section 1 of the Act of April 19,
21 1950 (Public Law 474), \$800,000.

22 Payment to Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians,
23 Oklahoma: For an additional amount for "Payment to
24 Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians, Oklahoma",
25 for defraying the expenses of making per capita payments

1 authorized by the Acts of June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 483),
2 and June 24, 1948 (Public Law 754, Eightieth Congress),
3 \$25,000.

4 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

5 Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except
6 the revolving fund for loans) shall be available for purchase
7 of not to exceed two hundred and twenty-seven passenger
8 motor vehicles, of which one hundred and ninety-one shall
9 be for replacement only, which may be used for the trans-
10 portation of Indians; purchase of ice for official use of em-
11 ployees; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
12 of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including not to ex-
13 ceed \$5,000 for expenditure at rates for individuals not in
14 excess of \$100 per diem on irrigation and power matters,
15 when authorized by the Secretary; and expenses required
16 by continuing or permanent treaty provisions.

17 CLAIMS AND TREATY OBLIGATIONS

18 For fulfilling treaties with Senecas and Six Nations of
19 New York, Choctaws and Pawnees of Oklahoma, and pay-
20 ment to Indians of Sioux reservations, to be expended as
21 provided by law, such amounts as may be necessary after
22 June 30, 1951.

23 PROCEEDS FROM POWER

24 Sums not in excess of the amount of power revenues
25 covered into the Treasury during the current and each suc-

ceeding fiscal year to the credit of each of the power projects, including revenues credited prior to August 7, 1946, to remain available until expended for the purposes authorized by section 3 of the Act of August 7, 1946, as amended (31 U. S. C. 725s-3), in connection with the respective projects from which such revenues are derived.

TRIBAL FUNDS

In addition to the tribal funds authorized to be expended by existing law, there is hereby appropriated \$2,080,000 from tribal funds not otherwise available for expenditure for the benefit of Indians and Indian tribes, including pay and travel expenses of employees; care, tuition and other assistance to Indian children attending public and private schools (which may be paid in advance or from date of admission); purchase of land and improvements on land, title to which shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the tribe for which purchased; lease of lands and water rights; compensation and expenses of attorneys and other persons employed by Indian tribes under approved contracts; pay, travel and other expenses of tribal officers, councils, and committees thereof, or other tribal organizations, including mileage for use of privately owned automobiles and per diem in lieu of subsistence at rates established administratively but not to exceed those applicable to civilian employees of the Government; relief of Indians,

1 without regard to section 7 of the Act of May 27, 1930
2 (46 Stat. 391), including cash grants; and employment of a
3 recreational director for the Menominee Reservation and a
4 curator for the Osage Museum, each of whom shall be
5 appointed with the approval of the respective tribal councils
6 and without regard to the classification laws: *Provided*, That
7 in addition to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds
8 may be advanced to Indian tribes during the current fiscal
9 year for such purposes as may be designated by the gov-
10 erning body of the particular tribe involved and approved by
11 the Secretary: *Provided further*, That no part of this appro-
12 priation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water
13 rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, Washington,
14 and Wyoming, either inside or outside the boundaries of
15 existing Indian reservations.

16 BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

17 For carrying out the functions of the Bureau of Recla-
18 mation as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (Act of
19 June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof
20 or supplementary thereto) and other Acts and treaties
21 applicable to that Bureau, as follows:

22 GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

23 For engineering and economic investigations of pro-
24 posed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water
25 conservation and development plans; engineering and eco-

1 nomic investigations, as a basis for legislation, and for
2 reports thereon to Congress, relating to projects for the
3 development and utilization of the water resources of
4 Alaska; formulating plans and preparing designs and speci-
5 fications for authorized Federal reclamation projects or
6 parts thereof prior to appropriations for construction of
7 such projects or parts; and activities preliminary to the
8 reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial ad-
9 justment, or extension of existing projects; to remain
10 available until expended, \$5,000,000, of which \$4,265,-
11 000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and
12 \$500,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River develop-
13 ment fund: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any sums
14 from this appropriation for investigations of any nature
15 requested by States, municipalities, or other interests shall
16 be upon the basis of the State, municipality, or other interest
17 advancing at least 50 per centum of the estimated cost of
18 such investigations: *Provided further*, That, except as herein
19 expressly provided with respect to investigations in Alaska,
20 no part of this appropriation shall be expended in the con-
21 duct of activities which are not authorized by law.

22 CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

23 For construction and rehabilitation of authorized rec-
24 lamation projects or parts thereof (including power trans-
25 mission facilities) and for other related activities, as au-

1 thorized by law, to remain available until expended,
2 \$207,190,000, of which \$29,202,200 shall be derived from
3 the reclamation fund.

4 Of the amount appropriated under the preceding para-
5 graph, \$1,000,000 is for partial liquidation of the contract
6 authority granted under the appropriation "General fund,
7 construction, Missouri River Basin", in the Interior Depart-
8 ment Appropriation Act, 1950.

9 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

10 For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects
11 or parts thereof and of other facilities, as authorized by law;
12 and for a soil and moisture conservation program on lands
13 under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant
14 to law, \$15,385,000, of which not to exceed \$12,883,900
15 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and not to ex-
16 ceed \$1,671,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River
17 dam fund: *Provided*, That funds advanced for operation
18 and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof
19 shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and
20 may be expended for the same objects and in the same
21 manner as sums appropriated herein may be expended,
22 and the unexpended balances of such advances shall be
23 credited to the appropriation for the next succeeding fiscal
24 year: *Provided further*, That after December 31, 1951,

1 no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be
2 used for payment of the cost of operation and maintenance
3 of Imperial Dam and the All-American Canal and appurte-
4 nant works to and including Pilot Knob check and wasteway
5 (engineer station 1098) for the purpose of diversion or car-
6 riage of water for any water user, district, or association
7 unless and until arrangements, satisfactory to the Secretary,
8 shall have been made for payment annually to the United
9 States of the part of such cost allocable to such water user,
10 district, or association.

11 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

12 For necessary expenses of general administration and
13 related functions in the offices of the Commissioner of Rec-
14 lamation and in the regional offices of the Bureau of Recla-
15 mation, \$5,500,000, to be derived from the reclamation fund
16 and to be nonreimbursable pursuant to the Act of April
17 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377) : *Provided*, That no part of
18 any other appropriation in this Act shall be available for
19 activities or functions budgeted for the current fiscal year
20 as general administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That
21 not exceeding \$150,000 of funds available for expenditure
22 under this appropriation shall be used for salaries and ex-
23 penses in connection with information work.

EMERGENCY FUND

2 For an additional amount for the emergency fund as
3 authorized by the Act of June 26, 1948 (43 U. S. C. 502) ,
4 \$500,000, to be derived from the Reclamation fund, special
5 fund, and to remain available until expended for the purposes
6 specified in said Act.

7 TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FACILITIES, FORT PECK PROJECT,
8 MONTANA

The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to transfer to the Department of the Interior without exchange of funds, all of the right, title, and interest of the Department of the Army in and to the following facilities, including rights-of-way (except that portion of the rights-of-way within the Fort Peck Reservoir area), but there shall be reserved the right to use the power facilities for the purpose of transmitting power to the Fort Peck project during emergency periods when the Fort Peck power plant is not functioning: (a) the Fort Peck-Rainbow (Great Falls) 161 kilovolt transmission line; (b) the Rainbow (Great Falls) terminal facilities; and (c) the Fort Peck-Whatley 50 kilovolt transmission line and substation.

SPECIAL FUNDS

23 Sums herein referred to as being derived from the reclama-
24 tion fund, the Colorado River dam fund, or the Colorado
25 River development fund, are appropriated from the special

1 funds in the Treasury created by the Act of June 17, 1902
2 (43 U. S. C. 391), the Act of December 21, 1928 (43
3 U. S. C. 617a), and the Act of July 19, 1940 (43 U. S. C.
4 618a), respectively. Such sums shall be transferred, upon
5 request of the Secretary, to be merged with and expended
6 under the heads herein specified; and the unexpended bal-
7 ances of sums transferred for expenditure under the heads
8 "Operation and maintenance" and "General administrative
9 expenses" shall revert and be credited to the special fund
10 from which derived.

11 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

12 Appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation shall be
13 available for purchase of not to exceed one hundred
14 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed
15 \$60,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
16 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including such services at
17 rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per day, when au-
18 thorized by the Secretary; payment of claims for damage to
19 or loss of property, personal injury, or death arising out of
20 activities of the Bureau of Reclamation; payment, except as
21 otherwise provided for, of compensation and expense of per-
22 sons on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as
23 authorized by law to represent the United States in the nego-
24 tiation and administration of interstate compacts without re-
25 imbursement or return under the reclamation laws; rewards

1 for information or evidence concerning violations of law in-
2 volving property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Rec-
3 lamation; performance of the functions specified under the
4 head "Operation and Maintenance Administration", Bureau
5 of Reclamation, in the Interior Department Appropriation
6 Act, 1945; preparation and dissemination of useful informa-
7 tion including recordings, photographs, and photographic
8 prints; and studies of recreational uses of reservoir areas, as
9 authorized by law: *Provided*, That no part of any appropria-
10 tion made herein shall be available pursuant to the Act of
11 April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377), for expenses other than
12 those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects ex-
13 cept \$5,500,000 under the head "General Administrative
14 Expenses" and \$1,000,000 for reconnaissance, basin surveys,
15 and general engineering and research under the head
16 "General Investigations."

17 Allotments to the Missouri River Basin project from the
18 appropriation under the head "Construction and rehabilita-
19 tion" shall be available additionally for said project for those
20 functions of the Bureau of Reclamation provided for under
21 the head "General investigations" (but this authorization
22 shall not preclude use of the appropriation under said head
23 within that area), and for the continuation of investigations
24 by agencies of the Department on a general plan for the
25 development of the Missouri River Basin. Such allotments

1 may be expended through or in cooperation with State and
2 other Federal agencies, and advances to such agencies are
3 hereby authorized.

4 Sums appropriated herein which are expended in the
5 performance of functions of the Bureau of Reclamation shall
6 be reimbursable or returnable to the extent and in the manner
7 provided by law.

8 Any agency of the United States Government having
9 title thereto is authorized to transfer to the Bureau of
10 Reclamation, without reimbursement, parts, equipment and
11 supplies for aircraft excess to its needs.

12 No part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Rec-
13 lamation, contained in this Act or in any prior Act,
14 which represents amounts earned under the terms of a con-
15 tract but remaining unpaid, shall be obligated for any other
16 purpose, regardless of when such amounts are to be paid:
17 *Provided*, That the incurring of any obligation prohibited
18 by this paragraph shall be deemed a violation of section
19 665 of title 31 of the United States Code.

20 No funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation
21 for operation and maintenance, except those derived from
22 advances by water users, shall be used for the particular
23 benefit of lands (a) within the boundaries of an irrigation
24 district, (b) of any member of a water users' organization,
25 or (c) of any individual, when such district, organization,

1 or individual is in arrears for more than twelve months
2 in the payment of charges due under a contract entered
3 into with the United States pursuant to laws administered
4 by the Bureau of Reclamation.

5 Not to exceed \$1,684,000 of the appropriation herein
6 made for "Construction and rehabilitation, Bureau of Rec-
7 lamation" shall be available for expenditure toward comple-
8 tion of construction of the Coachella division of the All-
9 American Canal system, Boulder Canyon project: *Provided*,
10 That prior thereto contractual arrangements satisfactory to
11 the Secretary shall be made for repayment of sums so ex-
12 pended in excess of the amount required to be repaid under
13 the existing contract between the Coachella County Water
14 District and the United States.

15 Not to exceed 12 per centum of the construction allot-
16 ment made by the Bureau of Reclamation for any project
17 from the appropriation "Construction and Rehabilitation"
18 contained in this Act shall be available for construction
19 work by force account or on a hired-labor basis; except
20 that not to exceed \$225,000 may on approval of the Com-
21 missioner be expended for construction work by force
22 account on any one project or Missouri Basin unit when the
23 work is unsuitable for contract or when excessive bids are
24 received; and except in cases of emergencies local in char-
25 acter, so declared by the Commissioner.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for the Geological Survey to perform surveys, investigations, and research covering topography, geology, and the mineral and water resources of the United States, its Territories and possessions; classify lands as to mineral character and water and power resources; give engineering supervision to power permits and Federal Power Commission licenses; enforce departmental regulations applicable to oil, gas, and other mining leases, permits, licenses, and operating contracts; and publish and disseminate data relative to the foregoing activities; \$22,900,000, of which \$3,300,000 shall be available only for cooperation with States or municipalities for water resources investigations: *Provided*, That the share of the Geological Survey in any topographic mapping or water resources investigations carried on in cooperation with any State or municipality shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost thereof.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The amount appropriated for the Geological Survey shall be available for purchase of not to exceed one hundred and seventeen passenger motor vehicles, of which eighty shall be for replacement only; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service for protection of confidential files; contracting for the furnishing

1 of topographic maps and for the making of geophysical or
2 other specialized surveys when it is administratively de-
3 termined that such procedures are in the public interest;
4 construction and maintenance of necessary buildings and
5 appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands for gaging sta-
6 tions; and payment of compensation and expenses (not to
7 exceed \$10,000) of the person appointed by the President
8 to participate as the representative of the United States
9 in the administration of the compact consented to by the
10 Act of May 31, 1949 (Public Law 82): *Provided*, That
11 notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Presi-
12 dent is authorized to appoint a retired officer as such repre-
13 sentative, without prejudice to his status as a retired Army
14 officer, and he shall receive such compensation and expenses
15 in addition to his retired pay.

16 BUREAU OF MINES

17 CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL 18 RESOURCES

19 For expenses necessary for promoting the conservation,
20 exploration, development, production, and utilization of min-
21 eral resources, including fuels, in the United States, its Ter-
22 ritories, and possessions; developing synthetics and substi-
23 tutes; producing and distributing helium; and controlling
24 fires in inactive coal deposits on public lands, and on private

1 lands, with the consent of the owner; \$17,950,000:
2 *Provided*, That the Secretary is hereby authorized and
3 directed to make suitable arrangements with owners of
4 private property or with a State or its subdivisions for
5 payment of a sum equal to not less than one-half
6 the amount of expenditure to be made for control or ex-
7 tinguishment of fires in inactive coal deposits from funds
8 provided under the authorization of this Act except that
9 expenditure of Federal funds for this purpose in any privately
10 owned operating coal mine shall be limited to investigation
11 and supervision.

12 HEALTH AND SAFETY

13 For expenses necessary for promotion of health and
14 safety in mines and in the minerals industries, as authorized
15 by law, \$3,790,000.

16 CONSTRUCTION

17 For construction and improvement of facilities under
18 the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Mines, to remain available
19 until expended, \$1,250,000: *Provided*, That the unused
20 balance of the contract authorization of \$15,000,000 granted
21 in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1946, under
22 the head "Synthetic liquid fuels", is hereby rescinded.

1 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

2 For expenses necessary for general administration of the
3 Bureau of Mines, including such expenses in the regional
4 offices, \$1,290,000.

5 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

6 Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of
7 Mines may be expended for purchase of not to exceed one
8 hundred and fifty-one passenger motor vehicles, of which
9 one hundred and thirty shall be for replacement only; pro-
10 viding transportation services in isolated areas for employees,
11 student dependents of employees, and other pupils, and such
12 activities may be financed under cooperative arrangements;
13 temporary and emergency contracts for personal services
14 and employment of persons without regard to civil-service
15 regulations as required in the conduct of programs for the
16 control of fires in inactive coal deposits and flood prevention
17 in anthracite mines; purchase and bestowal of certificates
18 and trophies in connection with mine rescue and first-aid
19 work: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to accept
20 lands, buildings, equipment and other contributions from
21 public and private sources and to prosecute projects in coop-
22 eration with other agencies, Federal, State, or private: *Pro-*
23 *vided further*, That power produced in the operation of the
24 power plant of the Bureau of Mines at Louisiana, Missouri,
25 in excess of the Bureau's needs may be sold to non-Federal

1 purchasers, but the expenses of the Bureau in the production
2 and sale of such excess power shall not exceed the total
3 amount of such sales, and expenditures for the production
4 of excess power shall not be deemed a charge against the
5 total appropriations authorized by the Synthetic Liquid Fuels
6 Act, as amended: *Provided further*, That the sums made
7 available for the current fiscal year to the Departments of the
8 Army, Navy, and Air Force for the acquisition of helium
9 from the Bureau of Mines shall be transferred to the Bureau
10 of Mines on July 1 of said fiscal year: *Provided further*,
11 That the Bureau of Mines is authorized, during the current
12 fiscal year, to sell directly or through any Government
13 agency, including corporations, any metal or mineral product
14 that may be manufactured in pilot plants operated by the
15 Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such sales shall be
16 covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

17 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

18 MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

19 For expenses necessary for the management and pro-
20 tection of the areas and facilities administered by the
21 National Park Service, including protection of lands in
22 process of condemnation; and for plans, investigations, and
23 studies of the recreational resources (exclusive of prepara-
24 tion of detailed plans and working drawings) and archaeo-
25 logical values in river basins of the United States (except

1 the Missouri River Basin) ; \$7,735,000: *Provided*, That the
2 unexpended balance of the appropriation granted under this
3 head for the fiscal year 1951 for the "Mississippi River
4 Parkway" shall remain available during the current fiscal
5 year.

6 MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL
7 FACILITIES

8 For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance,
9 and rehabilitation of roads, trails, buildings, utilities, and
10 other physical facilities essential to the operation of areas
11 administered pursuant to law by the National Park Service,
12 \$7,300,000.

13 CONSTRUCTION

14 For construction and improvement, without regard to
15 the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended (16 U. S. C. 451),
16 of roads, trails, parkways, buildings, utilities, and other
17 physical facilities; and the acquisition of lands, interests
18 therein, improvements, and water rights; to remain avail-
19 able until expended, \$11,975,000, of which \$1,150,000 is
20 for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority
21 granted under the head "Independence National Historical
22 Park, Pennsylvania", in the Interior Department Appro-
23 priation Act, 1950, and \$3,000,000 is for liquidation of

1 obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in section
2 4 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

3 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

4 For expenses necessary for general administration of
5 the National Park Service, including such expenses in the
6 regional offices, \$1,284,500.

7 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

8 Appropriations for the National Park Service shall be
9 available for purchase of not to exceed twenty-two pas-
10 senger motor vehicles, of which nineteen shall be for replace-
11 ment only; cleaning and repair of uniforms for National
12 Capital Parks police and guards; and the objects and pur-
13 poses specified in the Act of August 7, 1946 (16 U. S. C.
14 17j-2).

15 FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

16 MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES

17 For expenses necessary for conservation, management,
18 protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources, and
19 for the performance of other authorized functions related to
20 such resources; operation of the industrial properties within
21 the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770);
22 maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita
23 Mountains Wildlife Refuge; purchase or rent of land, and

1 functions related to wildlife management in California (16
2 U. S. C. 695-695c) ; and not to exceed \$30,000 for pay-
3 ment, in the discretion of the Secretary, for information or
4 evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the
5 Fish and Wildlife Service; \$6,870,000.

6

INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

7 For expenses necessary for scientific and economic
8 studies and investigations respecting conservation, manage-
9 ment, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife re-
10 sources, including related aquatic plants and products; col-
11 lection, compilation, and publication of information concern-
12 ing such studies and investigations; and the performance of
13 other functions related thereto; as authorized by law;
14 \$4,046,000.

15

CONSTRUCTION

16 For construction and acquisition of buildings and other
17 facilities required in the conservation, management, pro-
18 tection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources and the
19 acquisition of lands and interests therein, including con-
20 tinuing the construction of fish cultural facilities on lands
21 owned by the State of South Dakota; to remain available
22 until expended, \$750,000.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Fish and Wildlife Service, including such expenses in the regional offices, \$882,000.

FEDERAL AID IN FISH RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 9, 1950 (Public Law 681), amounts equal to the revenues described in section 3 of said Act and credited during the next preceding fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATION OF PRIBILOF ISLANDS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of February 26, 1944, as amended (16 U. S. C. 631a-631q), amounts equal to 60 per centum of the proceeds covered into the Treasury during the next preceding fiscal year from the sale of sealskins and other products, to remain available for expenditure during the current and next succeeding fiscal years.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service shall be available for purchase of not to exceed eighty-five passenger motor vehicles, of which seventy-four shall be for

1 replacement only; purchase of not to exceed six aircraft
2 for replacement only; publication and distribution of bul-
3 letins as authorized by law (7 U. S. C. 417); rations or
4 commutation of rations for officers and crews of vessels
5 at rates not to exceed \$2 per man per day; repair of
6 damage to public roads within and adjacent to reserva-
7 tion areas caused by operations of the Fish and Wildlife
8 Service; options for the purchase of land at not to ex-
9 ceed \$1 for each option; facilities incident to such public
10 recreational uses on conservation areas as are not inconsistent
11 with their primary purposes; and the maintenance and im-
12 provement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities under the
13 jurisdiction of the Fish and Wildlife Service and to which
14 the United States has title, and which are utilized pursuant
15 to law in connection with management and investigation
16 of fish and wildlife resources.

17 OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

18 ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

19 For expenses necessary for the administration of Terri-
20 tories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under
21 the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including
22 expenses of the Offices of the Governors of Alaska, Hawaii,
23 Guam, American Samoa, the Government of the Virgin
24 Islands, including the agricultural station, and of the High
25 Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

1 compensation and mileage of members of the legislatures in
 2 Alaska, Hawaii, Guam and American Samoa; compensation
 3 and expenses of the judiciary in American Samoa and the
 4 Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; care of insane as au-
 5 thorized by law for Alaska (48 U. S. C. 46-50); grants to
 6 the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust
 7 Territory of the Pacific Islands, in addition to current local
 8 revenues, for support of governmental functions; and per-
 9 sonal services, household equipment and furnishings, and
 10 utilities necessary in the operation of the several Governors'
 11 houses, and the residence of the High Commissioner of the
 12 Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; \$7,020,000: *Provided*,
 13 That the territorial and local governments of the Virgin
 14 Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of
 15 the Pacific Islands are authorized to make purchases through
 16 the General Services Administration.

17 ALASKA PUBLIC WORKS

18 For an additional amount for expenses necessary for
 19 carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 24, 1949
 20 (Public Law 264), to remain available until June 30, 1955,
 21 \$7,000,000, of which not to exceed \$500,000 shall be avail-
 22 able for administrative expenses.

23 CONSTRUCTION OF ROADS, ALASKA

24 For construction of roads, tramways, buildings, ferries,
 25 bridges, and trails, including surveys and plans for new road

1 construction; acquisition of lands or interests in lands by
2 purchase, donation, condemnation, or otherwise; to remain
3 available until expended, \$20,000,000, of which not to ex-
4 ceed \$8,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred
5 pursuant to authority previously granted.

6 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF ROADS, ALASKA

7 For operation and maintenance of roads, tramways,
8 buildings, ferries, bridges, and trails, \$2,600,000.

9 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

10 The total of the amounts herein appropriated for con-
11 struction, operation and maintenance of roads in Alaska shall
12 be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein
13 made for operation and maintenance shall be available only
14 for the service of the current fiscal year.

15 Not to exceed 25 per centum of the amount herein
16 appropriated for construction of roads in Alaska shall be
17 available for construction work by force account, or on a
18 hired labor basis.

19 CONSTRUCTION, ALASKA RAILROAD

20 For the authorized work of the Alaska Railroad, includ-
21 ing improvements and new construction, to remain available
22 until expended, \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That funds appro-
23 priated under this head may be transferred to the Alaska

1 Railroad Special Fund for purposes of accounting and
2 administration.

3 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ALASKA RAILROAD

4 The Alaska Railroad Special Fund shall continue avail-
5 able until expended for the work authorized by law, includ-
6 ing operation of facilities under the jurisdiction of the railroad
7 in Mount McKinley National Park; operation and mainte-
8 nance of oceangoing or coastwise vessels by ownership, char-
9 ter, or arrangement with other branches of the Government
10 service, for the purpose of providing additional facilities for
11 transportation of freight, passengers, or mail, when deemed
12 necessary for the benefit and development of industries or
13 travel in the area served; and payment of compensation and
14 expenses as authorized by section 42 of the Act of Septem-
15 ber 7, 1916 (5 U. S. C. 793), to be reimbursed as therein
16 provided: *Provided*, That no one other than the general
17 manager of said railroad, and one assistant general manager
18 at not to exceed \$13,000 per annum, shall be paid an annual
19 salary out of said fund of more than \$11,000.

20 VIRGIN ISLANDS PUBLIC WORKS

21 For an additional amount to carry out the provisions of
22 the Act of December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 827), \$1,000,-
23 000: *Provided*, That the estimated project costs specified

1 in said Act of December 20, 1944, shall not constitute limita-
2 tions on amounts that may be expended for such projects.

3 ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary
6 of the Interior (referred to herein as the Secretary), includ-
7 ing teletype rentals and service; \$2,365,000.

8 GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

9 SEC. 102. Appropriations made in this Act shall be
10 available for the purchase of station wagons without such
11 vehicles being considered as passenger motor vehicles.

12 SEC. 103. Notwithstanding any provision of law to the
13 contrary, aliens may be employed during the current fiscal
14 year in the field service of the Department for periods of
15 not more than thirty days in cases of emergency caused by
16 fire, flood, storm, act of God, or sabotage.

17 SEC. 104. Appropriations in this Act available for
18 travel expenses shall be available, under regulations pre-
19 scribed by the Secretary, for expenses of attendance of officers
20 and employees at meetings or conventions of members of
21 societies or associations concerned with the work of the
22 bureau or office for which the appropriation concerned is
23 made.

24 SEC. 105. Appropriations made in this Act shall be
25 available for expenditure or transfer (within each

1 bureau or office), with the approval of the Secre-
2 tary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement
3 or repair of buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equip-
4 ment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other
5 unavoidable causes: *Provided*, That no funds shall be made
6 available under this authority until funds specifically made
7 available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies
8 shall have been exhausted.

9 SEC. 106. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure
10 or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropria-
11 tion in this Act, in addition to the amounts included in the
12 budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression
13 or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threat-
14 ening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the In-
15 terior: *Provided*, That appropriations made in this Act for
16 fire suppression purposes shall be available for the payment
17 of obligations incurred during the preceding fiscal year.

18 SEC. 107. Appropriations made in this Act shall be
19 available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and
20 similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will
21 contribute to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations
22 shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activ-
23 ity in the same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30,
24 1932 (31 U. S. C. 686): *Provided*, That reimbursements
25 for cost of supplies, materials and equipment, and for serv-

1 ices rendered may be credited to the appropriation current
2 at the time such reimbursements are received.

3 SEC. 108. Appropriations made in this Act shall be
4 available for services as authorized by section 15 of the
5 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) when authorized
6 by the Secretary; maintenance and operation of aircraft;
7 hire of passenger motor vehicles; examination of estimates
8 of appropriations in the field; payment for telephone service
9 in private residences in the field, when authorized under
10 regulations approved by the Secretary; and the payment
11 of dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library mem-
12 bership in societies or associations which issue publications
13 to members only or at a price to members lower than to
14 subscribers who are not members.

15 SEC. 109. During the current fiscal year the head of any
16 Department or establishment of the Government having funds
17 available for scientific and technical investigations within the
18 scope of the functions of the Department of the Interior
19 may, with the approval of the Secretary, transfer to the
20 Department such sums as may be necessary therefor, which
21 sums so transferred may be expended for the same objects
22 and in the same manner as sums appropriated herein but
23 without their limitations.

24 SEC. 110. The balances of all contract authorizations
25 heretofore granted to the Interior Department or any of its

1 bureaus or offices, which remain unused on June 30, 1952,
2 are hereby rescinded.

3 SEC. 111. Transfers to the Department of the Interior,
4 pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Serv-
5 ices Act of 1949, of equipment, material and supplies, ex-
6 cess to the needs of Federal agencies may be made at the
7 request of the Secretary without reimbursement or transfer
8 of funds when required by the Department for operations
9 conducted in Territories and island possessions.

10 SEC. 112. No part of the funds made available by this
11 Act may be used to compensate any person for employment
12 in the Federal service outside the continental limits of the
13 United States at a rate higher than is paid for comparable
14 work in the Federal service within the continental limits of
15 the United States, other than a person who was a resident
16 citizen of the continental United States at the date of his
17 appointment to a position outside the continental limits of
18 the United States and has had continuous employment in
19 the Federal service (except as interrupted by service in the
20 Armed Forces of the United States) from the date of such
21 appointment.

22 TITLE II—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

23 REVOLVING FUND

24 For an additional amount for the revolving fund estab-
25 lished under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation

1 Act, 1950, to provide for advances to the Virgin Islands
2 Corporation as authorized by law, \$1,800,000.

3 GRANTS

4 For payment to the Virgin Islands Corporation in the
5 form of grants, for expenses incurred during the current fiscal
6 year, as authorized by section 8 of the Virgin Islands Cor-
7 poration Act, in the conduct of activities budgeted as pre-
8 dominantly nonrevenue producing, \$130,000: *Provided*,
9 That funds appropriated under this head in the Interior
10 Department Appropriation Act, 1951, for estimated losses
11 to be sustained during the fiscal year 1951, shall remain
12 available for estimated losses to be sustained during the fiscal
13 year 1952: *Provided further*, That an amount equal to the
14 excess of grants for estimated losses for revenue producing
15 activities over the actual loss for the fiscal year 1951 and
16 the estimated loss for the fiscal year 1952 shall be trans-
17 ferred from the appropriation for "Grants" to the "Revolv-
18 ing Fund, Virgin Islands Corporation" and shall be merged
19 therewith.

20 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

21 During the current fiscal year the Virgin Islands Cor-
22 poration is hereby authorized to make such expenditures,
23 within the limits of funds available to it and in accord
24 with law, and to make such contracts and commitments
25 without regard to fiscal-year limitations as provided by

1 section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as
2 amended, as may be necessary in carrying out its programs
3 as set forth in the budget for the fiscal year 1952: *Provided*,
4 That not to exceed \$130,000 shall be available for adminis-
5 trative expenses (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the
6 Corporation, covering the categories set forth in the 1952
7 Budget estimates for such expenses.

8 TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

9 SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this
10 Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any cor-
11 poration included in this Act, shall be used to pay the salary
12 or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the
13 Government of the United States or who is a member of
14 an organization of Government employees that asserts the
15 right to strike against the Government of the United States,
16 or who advocates, or is a member of an organization
17 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of
18 the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That
19 for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered
20 prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit
21 has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in
22 a strike against the Government of the United States, is not
23 a member of an organization of Government employees that
24 asserts the right to strike against the Government of the
25 United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is

1 not a member of an organization that advocates, the over-
2 throw of the Government of the United States by force or
3 violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages
4 in a strike against the Government of the United States or
5 who is a member of an organization of Government em-
6 ployees that asserts the right to strike against the Govern-
7 ment of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a
8 member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of
9 the Government of the United States by force or violence,
10 and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are
11 paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this Act
12 shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be
13 fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than
14 one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty
15 clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any
16 other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That in
17 cases of emergency, caused by fire, flood, storm, act of God,
18 or sabotage, persons may be employed for periods of not
19 more than thirty days and be paid salaries and wages with-
20 out the necessity of inquiring into their membership in any
21 organization.

22 This Act may be cited as the "Interior Department
23 Appropriation Act, 1952."

INDEX

	Page
Alaska Public Works-----	33
Alaska Railroad-----	34
Alaska roads-----	33
Bonneville Power Administration-----	5
Connally Hot Oil Act, enforcement of-----	2
Fine Arts Commission-----	5
Fish and Wildlife Service-----	29
General provisions-----	36 and 41
Geological Survey-----	23
Indian Affairs, Bureau of-----	9
Land Management, Bureau of-----	6
Mines, Bureau of-----	24
Park Service, National-----	27
Reclamation, Bureau of-----	14
Secretary's office-----	2 and 36
Southeastern Power Administration-----	2
Southwestern Power Administration-----	3
Territories, Office of-----	32
Virgin Islands Public Works-----	35
Virgin Islands Corporation-----	39

82ND CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3790

[Report No. 339]

A BILL

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

By Mr. KIRWAN

APRIL 20, 1951

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, under whose canopy of grace and goodness we dwell and whose love and care overshadow and surround all our days, grant that daily we may meet our duties with greater clarity of insight and a more vigorous loyalty.

We penitently confess that many noble tasks and causes, which need our allegiance and wholehearted support, often languish and fail of achievement because of our listlessness and complacency and our lack of conviction, consecration, and courage.

Forgive us for being at times so cynical and allowing ourselves to feel that we are the victims of a conspiracy, of fearful and fateful circumstances, and that the lofty aspirations, which we cherish, are hopelessly visionary.

Inspire us with that unity of spirit and understanding which recognizes individual differences but which subordinates them to the supreme and common goal of establishing peace on earth and the building of a finer social order in which there will be, among all the members of the human family, a mutual respect for personal and social rights and obligations.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2612. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District; and

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution making an emergency appropriation for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 285. An act relating to the acquisition and disposition of land and interests in land by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Federal Civil Defense Administration.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) entitled "Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens." Ordered that Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. JENNER be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 51-19.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on tomorrow and on Friday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

(Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution, which proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, in an effort to simplify the procedure for removing a President from office.

The impeachment proceedings for the removal of a President of the United States under our Constitution are cumbersome and impracticable. One man, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, is able to pigeonhole any motion made to impeach the President. This can be done by appointing a special committee which is stacked with administration supporters.

The joint resolution I am introducing simply makes it mandatory, upon the adoption of a resolution by two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress, that a special election be held to fill the offices of President, Vice President, Members of the Senate, and Members of the House of Representatives. This election shall be held 12 weeks after such a resolution has been adopted. The terms of the incumbent President, Vice President, and Members of Congress, shall terminate 14 days after the special election and the newly elected or reelected officials shall serve for the unexpired terms of their predecessors.

The office of the President of the United States carries with it great responsibilities. The decisions made by the President have immediate and future personal effect, not only upon the citizens of the United States, but upon other peoples of the world. A President

must possess many attributes. He must be a master politician in order to get elected, but a master politician without the capacity for statesmanship certainly is dangerous to the country he attempts to lead.

We all know that corrupt political machines and well-disciplined pressure groups seeking special services can be controlling factors in nominating and electing a man for President. A person can have served honorably in one public office but, due to the political pressures brought to bear upon him, be a failure in the office of Chief Executive.

The citizens of the United States should not be forced to accept weak and inadequate leadership for a period of 4 years when it is realized that the man elected does not have the capacity for the job. My resolution would make the office of President more responsive to the will of the people and the Congress and could force the administration to return to the people in an effort to secure a vote of confidence.

If the Constitution were amended in accordance with my resolution, it would apply to the present occupant of the White House.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 34]

Anfuso	Gossett	Morrison
Armstrong	Hall	Multer
Bakewell	Edwin Arthur	Murphy
Bonner	Harden	Powell
Bramblett	Heffernan	Rains
Brehm	Heller	Reece, Tenn.
Brownson	Hinshaw	Rivers
Buchanan	Hollifield	Rogers, Tex.
Burton	Irving	Roosevelt
Byrne, N. Y.	Javits	Sabath
Cannon	Jenison	Sadlak
Celler	Jonas	St. George
Crosser	Jones	Sasscer
Dawson	Hamilton C.	Scrivner
Dingell	Kee	Shafer
Dollinger	Kersten, Wis.	Sheehan
Doyle	Kilburn	Shelley
Engle	Klein	Sutton
Fellows	Lanham	Whitaker
Fine	Larcade	Wolcott
Fisher	Lucas	Woodruff
Forand	McKinnon	Yorty
Gillette	Meador	
Gore	Miller, N. Y.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 366 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CHARTERS OF VESSELS TO CITIZENS OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 223) to give the Department of Commerce the authority to extend certain charters of vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provisions of existing law, the Secretary of Commerce shall have the authority to extend and continue the present charters of vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines, which charters were made and entered into under the terms of section 306 (a) of the act of April 30, 1946 (Public Law 370, 79th Cong.). Such charters may be extended for such periods of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may, from time to time, determine to be required in the interest of the economy of the Philippines, but any such charter shall contain a provision requiring that the vessel shall be operated only in the interisland commerce in the Philippines. No such vessel shall be continued under charter beyond the completion of the first voyage terminating after April 30, 1954.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, strike out "1954" and insert "1952."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMORIAL SERVICES

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 205.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That on Wednesday, May 16, 1951, immediately after the approval of the Journal, the House shall stand at recess for the purpose of holding the memorial services as arranged by the Committee on House Administration under the provision of clause (1) (j) (2) (C) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The order of exercises and proceedings of the service shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and all Members shall have leave for 60 legislative days to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on the life, character, and public service of deceased Members. At the conclusion of the proceedings, the Speaker shall call the House to order and then as a further remark of respect to the memories of the deceased he shall declare the House adjourned. The necessary expenses connected with such memorial services shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the Committee on House Administration and approved by such committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3790, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read the first paragraph of the bill.

If there are no amendments to this paragraph, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, \$3,400,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARY: On page 2, strike out lines 7 through 13, inclusive.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to prevent the useless expenditure of money, materials and manpower, all of which are now greatly needed for the defense effort. The language which the amendment would strike from the bill appropriates \$3,400,000 to the Southeastern Power Administration for the construction of transmission lines to duplicate existing lines now in operation by private power companies. The amount, however, represents only a portion of the entire expenditure. The complete program of the Southeastern Power Administration calls for the expenditure of \$14,500,000 for the construction of duplicating lines.

In one of the supplemental appropriation bills passed last year, \$1,850,000 was requested. The appropriation was questioned in the Appropriations Committee, but no objection was raised on the

floor of the House. When, however, the bill reached the Senate, after a careful study, the Senate Appropriations Committee reached the conclusion that the expenditure of the funds was unnecessary and so reported to the Senate which struck the item from the bill. The House insisted upon its restoration in conference. The Senate finally agreed to the appropriation but with the insistence that no portion of the funds be spent until the Southeastern had made every reasonable effort to reach an agreement with existing companies for the distribution of its power—hearings, page 1456.

The major project involved in this proposal is the construction of transmission lines from Buggs Island Dam to Suffolk, Va., and thence to Langley Field. The Virginia Electric & Power Co. has been furnishing Langley Field with electricity for many years. It is ready, willing, and able to continue to furnish all of the power which the Government needs in that entire area. I understand that my very good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Washington State [Mr. JACKSON] made a statement on the floor yesterday that the Virginia Electric & Power Co. would not agree to furnish Langley Field 24-hour service. That is a grossly misleading statement, but I hasten to say that I am certain that Mr. JACKSON is not responsible for the statement, but is merely repeating what he has been told. The thing that bothers me is that a Government representative would knowingly furnish the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] with misinformation of this kind.

The facts are that the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics plans to construct a supersonic wind tunnel at Langley Field for experimental purposes. This tunnel when in operation will require a capacity load of 150,000 kilowatts. It would obviously affect the distribution of power within the entire area if this amount of power were used during peak-load hours. The NACA realizes this fact and has always used and will continue to use its experimental equipment only during off-peak hours. They have never requested 24-hour service for the use of this experimental equipment and according to competent engineering surveys the Southeastern could not furnish them a 150,000-kilowatt load more than 20 hours per week.

The Southeastern offered NACA a contract to furnish it with a 150,000-kilowatt load from 12 midnight to 6 p. m., and 70,000 kilowatts at other times. The Virginia Electric & Power Co. has offered to furnish it 150,000 kilowatts from midnight to 6 a. m., 100,000 kilowatts from 10 p. m. to midnight, and 70,000 during peak hours. This is more favorable to NACA than the Southeastern offer and is entirely satisfactory to NACA.

Moreover, the Virginia Electric & Power Co. has offered to supply the NACA with all the electricity it needs for identically the same price that the Southeastern proposes to charge them, and in addition it has offered the NACA three alternate proposals, all of which are

more favorable to NACA than the Southeastern proposal.

Moreover, the Virginia Electric & Power Co., in order to supply the Southeastern with an outlet for its Buggs Island power has agreed to transmit or, in the language of the industry, wheel that power over its lines. Negotiations have been in progress for some time over a wheeling and firming contract. All of you are no doubt acquainted with the fact that usually hydroelectric power varies with the available water supply and requires supplemental steam power to even or firm the supply.

The first proposal made by the Southeastern to the Virginia Electric & Power Co. was that the Southeastern would construct with public funds the lines to Suffolk, Petersburg, and certain distribution centers and would then pay the Virginia Electric & Power Co. 1 mill per kilowatt-hour for distributing the power from these centers. The Virginia Electric & Power Co., advised the Southeastern that they preferred to use their own transmission lines from the point at which the power is generated. This would save the Government the \$14,500,000 which the Southeastern proposed to spend for the construction of these lines. The Southeastern finally agreed to this plan, but will not agree to pay the company any more for wheeling the power from Buggs Island to Langley Field, a distance of 146 miles, than it had previously agreed to pay them for wheeling it from Suffolk to Langley Field, a distance of approximately 30 miles.

The Virginia Electric & Power Co. offered to wheel the power from Buggs Island to Langley Field for exactly the same price carried in both the Colorado and Montana contracts which have been approved by the Government and are now in force.

I understand my friend stated yesterday that they made a proposal of 1 to 4 mills for wheeling these services. They made the same proposal that the Government has already agreed to in other contracts, that they would wheel this power for 1 mill for the first 50 miles, 2 mills for the next 50 miles, and 3 mills for the third 50 miles. That has already been approved by the Government.

Those contracts provide for a 1-mill charge in the first 50-mile zone, 2 mills in the second 50-mile zone, and 3 mills in the third 50-mile zone. In an effort to reach a compromise the Virginia Electric & Power Co. further agreed to a reduction to one-half mill in the first 50-mile zone, which is cheaper than the contracts now in force, and when the Department of the Interior insisted on a flat rate, it agreed to a flat rate of 2 mills over the entire operation. This, the company estimates, is approximately the cost of this wheeling. It is cheaper than the Southeastern can wheel the power itself over Government-constructed lines because if you apply the standard carrying charge figure used by the Federal Power Commission on construction of this character of 5.95 percent, which includes 3-percent interest and depreciation, the carrying charges alone are \$860,000 annually on the \$14,500,000, or roughly 2 mills per kilowatt-hour, and

this does not include the operation and servicing of the lines.

The Virginia Electric & Power Co. stands ready to wheel the power at the price in effect on any major wheeling and firming Government contract now in effect. Moreover, when the Southeastern refused to accept these generous offers, the Virginia Electric & Power Co. proposed that the question of rates be submitted to the Federal Power Commission, each party agreeing to abiding by the Commission's decision.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Nothing could be more reasonable than this, since the Federal Power Commission, under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, has jurisdiction over rates fixed by the Secretary of the Interior on power from reservoir projects under control of the War Department. In other words, the Federal Power Commission has jurisdiction over the rates which Southeastern charges. The cost of wheeling the power is a basic factor in the determination of those rates. The Virginia Electric & Power Co. has agreed to submit this charge also to the Federal Power Commission, a Government tribunal. Here we have a dispute between a Government agency and a private enterprise. The private enterprise agrees to submit the dispute to another Government agency, and the Government agency involved will not agree to it.

I submit that nothing could be fairer, and in view of these concessions of the Virginia Electric & Power Co., the construction of the proposed line is absolutely unnecessary. The Government should not spend on this venture money, materials, and manpower, which are in short supply at the present time, and are desperately needed for our national defense in this critical period.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, less than a year ago in a supplemental appropriation bill Congress provided money for a transmission line from Buggs Island Dam to Langley Field, Va. The request was for \$1,850,000, and the total estimated cost of the line as about \$7,000,000. Why did this request come to the Congress? Why not find out about this before doing any more talking? Either the Virginia Electric & Power Co. seems to have little understanding of their country's need or they do not know anything about their own company. I may be wrong on one of the charges, but not on both. I still feel that they lack real patriotism or they do not know their own company.

Here is the offer the Virginia Electric & Power extended to the United States

Government in the crisis we are in today. The United States Government is going to spend millions of dollars more on Langley Field for an enlargement of wind tunnels. The Virginia company would transport power from their plant at Buggs Island to Langley Field for a very small portion of the time, one-eighth, I believe. Why do I bring these matters up? Testifying before the committee the secretary of the NACA—not a board of bureaucrats, but a board of scientists from some of the great universities and colleges of this country, said that the Virginia Electric & Power Co. made an offer to the United States Government in a crisis such as we are in today that if the Government would advance it \$4,100,000 the Virginia Electric & Power would build the line. That offer afterward fell through. They required 150,000 kilowatts. The company only offered the Government to deliver that power for 1,000 hours a year, yet there are 8,760 hours in a year. Can you imagine a concern getting this privilege from this great Nation, yet offering to the Nation in its hour of need only 1,000 hours a year? That is the offer that the Virginia Electric & Power Co. made to the United States Government at a time when our boys are dying in Korea.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. GARY. I just wanted to say that the gentleman from Washington has informed me that he did not make the statement on yesterday about the 24 hours, but that the gentleman from Ohio did. I want to apologize to the gentleman from Washington. I was told that he made the statement, but that was an honest mistake.

Mr. KIRWAN. I made it then and I am making it now, because I am talking from the record.

Mr. GARY. I simply wanted to correct my statement in justice to the gentleman from Washington.

The gentleman, however, does not know how much Southeastern can furnish.

Mr. KIRWAN. They can furnish but 20 hours a week. I am telling the gentleman only what appears from the record. I do not care whether it is Southeastern or Southwestern; I am only talking from the record. That is what they offered this Government. I repeat what I said yesterday, suppose one of these scientists comes up with an idea—then what? Under the Virginia Power & Light proposal, this scientist would have to wait until midnight before he could develop it. He could get the power only at that time. On top of that they only wanted to furnish a limited number of kilowatts. The project might require more power for an experiment than they could get under the company proposal.

What do we have going on in this country today? The biggest thing is stockpiling—whether it is rubber, steel, lead, copper, or whatever it is. All we are doing here is stockpiling our own electricity, not buying it but stockpiling by building a line of our own so that when we want electricity we will have it

and have it in our own defense set-up. We will not have to depend upon anybody else. The record shows that a line was out of operation for 5 or 6 hours last fall just before they came to the Congress to ask for this money. That service break was not far from Langley Field. The gentleman who preceded me said it passed the House. It was stated that nine Congressmen from Virginia opposed that line. But when it got on the floor there was not one of the nine Congressmen opposed to that line. It was out in the open then; it is now. There was no opposition in the House to that line.

When it got to the Senate, yes, by a vote of 21 to 4 they kicked it out in committee, but when it got to the floor of the Senate by amendment, on a roll-call vote where they are recorded, they voted to build that transmission line right up to Langley Field.

Let us look at that great power company over in Virginia. There are three such wind tunnels in the United States, one located at Langley Field, Va.; one located at Cleveland, Ohio; and one located out at Moffett Field, Calif. Out at Moffett Field, Calif., they have hydro-electricity and mix it with steam power. In Cleveland they have to depend on coal. They have to ship coal 200 miles. Yet, Cleveland, Ohio, the private company that pays for and ships coal 200 miles to generate power furnishes cheaper power to the United States Government than they do in California and over at Langley Field. Virginia gets cheaper coal probably than any place in the United States because it is in the greatest coal center of the country and on two of the greatest coal-carrying railroads, the Virginia and the Chesapeake & Ohio. Yet they charge more money in Virginia for electricity today—not tomorrow, not last year but right today. In Virginia, they charge more money to the United States Government for furnishing power to that wind tunnel than others do in Cleveland, Ohio, and Moffett Field, Calif. That is the record.

That is why the United States Government is asking the Congress today to keep this line in that we put it there last fall. There never was a time in the history of this country when the chips were down more than they are today and the test is the line to Langley Field.

Can you think of any nation in the world that would want to deprive its government, with a war going on, of this privilege. Can you seriously consider tossing out this power line that \$1,850,000 has already been spent on? What kind of saving is that? What kind of legislation is this? They tell you they are going to save a million dollars. Some of the \$1,850,000, according to the Secretary of the Interior, has already been spent on that line, and his letter was mentioned on this floor yesterday.

That is why I am asking every Member of Congress to stop and think about what is at stake before they toss this line out. You know that the Government has many millions invested in Langley Field and another substantial investment to generate this power at Buggs Island when it is finally finished. There

will be an investment of many millions when all this is done, yet we do not want to put in a little line that is going to cost a few million dollars to assure the kids in Korea or any part of the world that back on the home front they are doing their part to win the war.

(Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I tried to explain in general debate the philosophy that the committee has tried to follow in the building of transmission lines from Government dams to the preferred customers as provided by the Flood Control Act of 1944, section 4. The committee has made it clear, and by its action in connection with this appropriation bill made it clear, that we have no desire to build unnecessary transmission lines. Under the basic law the committee has the responsibility of providing funds to carry out the provisions of existing law. If transmission lines can be built by private power companies which will wheel the Government-owned power from the bus bar to the preferred customers—in this case a Government customer—at a reasonable rate, the Government will make those arrangements with the private power companies. I can only refer you to the action taken by the committee in connection with the bill now before the House. The committee has taken out a number of transmission lines where reasonable wheeling agreements have been entered into with the private utilities.

Now, we hear a lot about economy. By opposing the pending amendment we will save the Federal Government from paying an excessive amount for distributing its own electricity. Do you know the history of this negotiation that has been going on between the Virginia Electric & Power and the Government? Well, the power company started out with the most fantastic proposal that I have ever heard. I refer now to page 98 of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act for 1951. You will find on page 98 the proposal originally made by the power company on December 15, 1949, when the Southeastern Power Administration was not armed with sufficient bargaining power to talk on a fair and reasonable basis with a private power company. There had been no appropriation for a transmission line. Do you know what they proposed? Well, they proposed that the Government pay a \$4,100,000 connection charge for the purpose of getting power into Langley Field. What does \$4,100,000 represent? It represents the cost of building the entire line. They called that a connection charge. Here is a chance to protect the public interest. I am here interested in protecting Uncle Sam; to give Uncle Sam bargaining power to bring about a contract that will result in a fair and reasonable contract with the Government.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I know the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is right.

Mr. GARY. Is it not true that at the time this proposal was made there was some talk of moving the entire proving grounds or experimental station at Langley Field to the Midwest, and what the Virginia Electric & Power Co. suggested was that the Government build the line and they would deduct the cost of the line from the amount of electricity that was paid each month by the Government? Is that not true?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Where would the title to the line be in the meantime?

Mr. GARY. It would be in the Virginia Electric & Power Co. But that was a proposal made months ago, which has long since been canceled and forgotten; it was the first proposal. Now the Virginia Electric & Power Co. agrees to wheel this current, this electricity, at the cheapest charge that the Government is now getting anywhere in the Nation on a similar contract. Now, if they can get it any fairer than that, I would like to know.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I will answer my good friend from Virginia in this way. I have mentioned the early history of the negotiations for only one purpose: It proves the validity of the contention that we made right along that you must give the Government sufficient bargaining power to bring about a reasonable contract to protect the public interest. I am reciting this history to prove the point that if it had not been for the fact that we appropriated the money last year we would not have the proposal now that my good friend from Virginia has presented to the House. I understand they are willing to charge the same rates that have been charged in connection with the Montana power contract and the contract in Colorado. But I am further informed that at the present time the proposal has some gimmicks in it.

Mr. GARY. It is the same contract. They have agreed to accept identically the same contract.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I am told that the proposed contract as applied to this transaction will result in excessive charges for wheeling.

Mr. GARY. I have stated to the House that the gentleman has been grossly misinformed about this whole thing. That is exactly the point I made when I was making my statement.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I do not think I have been grossly misinformed. Imagine a private power company starting out negotiations proposing to make a connection charge which in fact is equal to the cost of building a line. In other words they wanted in the

beginning to charge the Government a connection charge of \$4,100,000, giving the power company title to the line.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Why would the gentleman call that a connection charge if it is to be repaid over a period of years?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. This is what the Virginia Electric & Power Co. called it.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman referred to it as a connecting charge, yet the contract contemplated repayment by the power company to the Government of the \$4,000,000 involved.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Yes, but that is under a lot of reservations. I will read the whole thing, if the gentleman wants me to.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not want to interfere with the gentleman's speech, but I do not want to be under the wrong impression about it.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I am sure no one is under the wrong impression.

Mr. COOLEY. The connecting charge is something that is usually not refunded, is it not?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Yes, that is normally true, but if this were a real legitimate proposal, why should not the title to the line be vested in the Federal Government? If they are coming in and asking as a connection charge an amount equal to the cost of building the line, what is the purpose of the Government's not building it? Suppose a person down the street wants to build a building, which has almost happened here, I believe, and he gets a Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan for the full amount of the cost, then turns around and rents the building to the Government? That is what we are doing here.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. That seems to be the order of the day, because we are accomplishing the same purpose through the issuance of certificates of necessity. It is done. I do not condone it, nevertheless it is done.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I am not condoning it, but two wrongs do not make a right. There is no reason why anything like that should be permitted to happen. What I am trying to get over to the Members of the House is the fact that the Government should be given sufficient bargaining power to bring about a contract that is going to protect the public interest. That is what we are trying to do in connection with this appropriation. It is a strange thing. The Government has entered into a lot of contracts in the Southwest Power area and in the Central Valley power area. They just signed an agreement 2 or 3 weeks ago. They signed one in Montana with the Montana Power Co., with the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bonneville Power Co. has signed a

contract. You tie the hands of Uncle Sam in trying to protect the legitimate interests of the United States. That is exactly what is at stake in this amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHEELER. How much is proposed to be spent by the Southeastern Power Administration for the total construction cost of this facility?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Of the line?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I believe it is about \$7,000,000.

Mr. WHEELER. Did I understand the gentleman a moment ago to say that the total proposed cost on the part of the Virginia Electric & Power Co. was the same as the connection charge, or \$4,100,000?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think the answer to that, I will say to my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia, is this: Deleted from that item of \$4,100,000 are some substations and switching stations. In addition costs have gone up since the original estimate.

Mr. WHEELER. I was just wondering as to the disparity there.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. There is no dispute as to the actual cost of constructing this line, whether the Government builds it, or whether a private power company builds it.

Mr. WOOD of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. WOOD of Georgia. I understood the gentleman to say that the contract offered by the Virginia Electric & Power Co. had some gimmicks in it. I am anxious to know something about that because we have to pass on it.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is correct. I do not have any of the details. The last offer apparently being made yesterday. I will say this, that since the appropriation was approved authorizing the building of this line in December the company has come in with a proposal which is about twice as favorable to the Government as it was prior to the favorable action taken by the Congress. I think it proves conclusively the necessity of again, if I may repeat, giving the Government sufficient authority to enter into a fair and reasonable contract. I love my good friend from Richmond, Va., and I assure you there is nothing personal about this. I just have a different point of view as have a majority of the committee, as to what should be done in this case.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman said a majority of the committee. Was not

the vote 3 to 3 in the subcommittee that heard this matter?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Then shall we say an effective majority.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. GOLDEN. Regardless of the past history of the negotiations between the Government and the Virginia Electric Power Co., do you from your study feel that they are now offering a fair proposition?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. If they can enter into a contract which will be in keeping with the standards set by the Government as to what is a reasonable and fair rate, and which has been agreed to by the other companies—yes—but here we are—we do not have a contract and if it had not been for the appropriation which was made last December we would not be able to enter into any kind of contract with them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NORRELL: On page 2, line 13, strike out "\$3,400,000" and insert "\$123,000."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I think in order to understand this we should know that part of this money, or \$3,277,000 is to construct the line from Buggs Island to Langley Field. There is a balance of \$123,000 which has been allowed to construct four small lines in the congressional district of Judge KERR from North Carolina.

What I am going to say will be divided into these areas: If my amendment is adopted you will allow four small lines in the district of Judge KERR. One line, known as Buggs Island-Rocky Mountain, will cost \$60,000. Another line \$15,000, Goldsboro-Wilson; and another line \$24,000, Goldsboro-Kinston. Then there is another line for \$24,000, Goldsboro-Carolina.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield.

Mr. GARY. I would like to state to the gentleman that I had intended offering the amendment in the form in which the gentleman now offers it, out of respect to my good friend, Judge KERR, who is a member of our committee. However, when it became known to the members of the North Carolina delegation, and since that line was in North Carolina, I did not feel as a Virginian that I should interfere with it. However, the members from the North Carolina delegation found out that that was my purpose, and the majority of them asked me to offer the amendment to strike out the entire amount, because they said they did not want the Southeastern coming down into North Carolina in competition with their private industry, and duplicate their lines in North Carolina, and I have offered the amendment to strike out the entire amount, purely in response to the request of a ma-

jority of the members from North Carolina.

Mr. NORRELL. Now, Mr. Chairman, you have before you those two matters: If my amendment is adopted you strike out the Buggs Island-Langley Field line. You would allow the other small lines.

I understand that these four municipalities in Judge KERR's district own their own power plants. They are not presently being supplied by any private power company. As far as I am concerned, I am willing to go along, since it is in his district alone, and since the lines go to municipalities that now own, control, and operate their own power plants.

Now, regarding the Buggs Island-Langley Field line, I like my chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. I would do anything he would ask me to do. He would not ask me to do anything that was not right. I like HENRY JACKSON. But, Mr. Chairman, as a defense matter, as a defense item, this line is no more in the interest of national defense than the purchase of reindeer would be in Alaska. It ought to be knocked out.

When it was allowed last fall there was a subcommittee vote of 3 to 3. Some of us tried to stop this then, but not having a majority we failed. I will say that then they had an effective majority, as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has said. This is not in the interest of national defense, I repeat, and the line should not be constructed.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. But why should an exception be made to a specifically named congressional district? Why should not the principle rise or fall, and why should one congressional district which is named be excepted from the whole project?

Mr. NORRELL. I tried to explain that. If the gentleman had been listening I think he probably would have heard that the municipalities affected by the \$123,000, own their own power plants. They have not yet gotten any power from the companies at all. There is no reason why, if they want a line to those municipalities under section 5 of the Flood Control Act, they ought not to have it, as I see it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] has expired.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for four additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. NORRELL. As to the Buggs Island-Langley Field line, let me say that the entire Virginia delegation last fall indicated that they did not want the line. The line, if constructed, would all be in the State of Virginia. I think the Members of the House from Virginia ought to know what Virginia wants. I am advised on reliable authority that the two United States Senators from Virginia are not in favor of the line. I know it is not in the interest of national

defense; I know it is a waste of money. But I want to say that I do not believe that anybody from Arkansas, Oklahoma, Washington, or Ohio need get on this floor and talk about the patriotism of that grand old State of Virginia. Bless your hearts. She was an American State way back yonder in the Thirteen Colonies. I will say that if the national defense needs every kilowatt of power in the great State of Virginia those great patriotic men and women will turn over the last kilowatt they have to the Government. Do not talk to me about the lack of patriotism of Members of the congressional delegation from Virginia or the senatorial delegation from Virginia; they are just as patriotic any time of the year as any Member here, or anybody else.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Let me say that Rocky Mount, Wilson, and the other two towns in the State of North Carolina have not been able to get power. Actually, Rocky Mount is partly in my district and partly in Mr. KERR's district. Rocky Mount owns a municipal plant which they have operated for many years very successfully and is serving people from my district now. I wish to ask if anybody on behalf of the municipality of Rocky Mount has appeared on behalf of this project? Or has anybody submitted any evidence indicating the necessity for building a line into the city of Rocky Mount?

Mr. NORRELL. No, sir. No one from any of those towns personally appeared before the committee. The only testimony came from the Interior Department.

I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Talking about patriotism, does the gentleman think it is patriotic for the Federal Government to force upon any State or congressional district in our Union something that it does not want?

Mr. NORRELL. I do not believe it is the duty of the gentleman from Arkansas to help do that at all, and I am not going to.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. FURCOLO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I think there can be no question in the mind of anyone concerning the patriotism of any member of the Virginia delegation or of the people of Virginia.

I think the most important thing in this particular matter is this: Apparently for some time there have been discussions going on between the company and the Government with reference to this matter. Now, as the gentleman from Washington, [Mr. JACKSON] pointed out, the position of the subcommittee has been in general that they do not want to spend any money where it is not necessary to spend it, and especially where a private concern can take care of the situation all around.

I do not know how important this matter is as far as defense is concerned but from all the evidence in the hearings and everything I have been able to learn apparently it has quite a bearing; and we can know, regardless of that, that one of the most important things in connection with the defense effort is the entire power situation with all of its ramifications.

The history of this transaction shows very clearly that right from the beginning the company had certain bargaining power and did its best to obtain what it wanted on its own terms. I hold no brief against the company for that; that is well within its rights.

On the other hand, you have to keep that background in mind, in my opinion, to be able to assess what our situation will be if the time comes when we need the facilities the Government wants to furnish. Having in mind this background and the bargaining that went on, I think even the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] will admit the fact of the matter is that right up until the very last minute this company did not come forward with a proposal that was equal to what the Government wanted. There was meeting after meeting. It gradually gave little by little by little and it was not until right at the end when it either had to meet the Government's terms or lose completely that it finally came forward in expressing its good faith. There is no harm in that, but you have to bear in mind that at this time the Government did have the bargaining power to be able to drive home its point.

What are you going to do some months from now if suddenly the Government in connection with the defense effort needs to have that power, needs to have those facilities? In view of that bargaining history are you going to have the Government then sit down with the company and ask for its cooperation?

No, Mr. Chairman, this entire situation shows that we cannot rely upon that private company if the chips are down and we need what it has to offer, patriotic as it may be. I do not question its patriotism. But the facts show very clearly it was not until a very short time ago that the company did come forward.

I should like to ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] if it is not true that the present offer of the company was made only a couple of weeks ago?

Mr. GARY. No. I think the gentleman is wrong in that. They have been negotiating constantly since last January. Proposals and counterproposals have been made. I think the last conferences were held within the last week or two. I believe that is correct.

Mr. FURCOLO. Is it not a fact that the final proposition offered by this company to the Government was made not more than 3 weeks ago?

Mr. GARY. Well, I made a proposition right here on the floor that has never been made and that is that the company will accept the cheapest contract that is in existence in the entire

United States that has been approved by the United States Government.

Mr. FURCOLO. Is it a fair statement to say that from the time these negotiations started the company at no time took a position meeting the terms that the Government wanted until 2 or 3 weeks ago?

Mr. GARY. I would not say that. I do not think they ever got to an agreement. They have been negotiating and as negotiations go, whenever you reach an agreement that is the end of it. They have not reached an agreement yet.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think the record will disclose that after the offer was made on December 15, 1949, which was a connection charge proposal of \$4,100,000, there was no further offer until a week before or the day before the committee had under consideration the appropriation of money for the item, which was in December of last year.

Mr. GARY. Did you not say the Government refused to negotiate?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I may say in passing that that was at a time when the company was under the impression that the matter was to be decided, whether they were under that impression rightly or wrongly.

May I say in conclusion that perhaps if there were no emergency, perhaps if there were no war, perhaps if there were not the possibility of great demand being made in the future, we might be satisfied to say: "Go ahead and take a chance." But with this matter being most essential in connection with the entire defense effort—facilities such as those—it is a question whether you want to make an error one way or the other. I think if we are going to make a mistake in being either too easy and lenient or we are going to bear down, I think we should err on the side of the Government being fully prepared and fully ready for whatever eventualities may arise.

This entire transaction, if you follow it through from beginning to end—and I think it is evident from what has been said on the floor—shows that this Government cannot expect full and complete cooperation of this company. The times may change so that we need it so badly and so immediately that we simply cannot afford to get the Government in a position where they are depending upon this company, because practical experience has shown that the company, perhaps acting for the best interests of its stockholders, which is its business, may perhaps make a bargain that the Government cannot meet.

Mr. GARY. Does the gentleman mean to tell this House that the Southeastern Power Administration can furnish all the current that Langley Field needs? Does not the gentleman know that they cannot furnish it and that they have to rely on the Virginia Electric & Power Co. to furnish that current?

Mr. FURCOLO. I do not have any opinion one way or the other. I will take the gentleman's word for it. But, I will say this, that I think this country is entitled to rely on the fact that the facilities are needed and the Government has a duty under its responsibility to see that they are provided. This committee has been very fair in striking out lines where past experience showed that perhaps there was no harm in doing it, but this is a different story.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. BARDEN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I object, Mr. Chairman.

[Mr. BARDEN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard this debate with great interest. I am in favor of more power and cheaper power, and I am in favor of constantly improving service. It is of little importance as to which congressional districts are involved, but I understand that actually about two-thirds of the proposed short lines will be in the district represented by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] and in the district which I represent. The important question presented here is whether or not the proposed lines are actually needed and should be built. If the lines are not necessary to the providing of adequate service, then it occurs to me that they should not be built. The city of Rocky Mount is in two congressional districts, part of which is in Judge KERR's district and the other part is in the fourth district which I represent. The city of Rocky Mount owns and has operated for many years a very modern power plant from which the city is served, and not only is the city served but the municipality has built rural lines from which many farm homes are likewise served. My home is about 10 miles west of the city of Rocky Mount, and the municipally owned power line reaches from Rocky Mount almost to the corporate limits of the town of Nashville where I live. The town of Nashville and that entire community have been well and adequately served by the Carolina Power & Light Co. I understand that the city of Rocky Mount has a contract with the Carolina Power & Light Co., under which both contracting parties have maintained a very satisfactory and mutually advan-

teous relationship. I am not aware of any shortage of electric power either in Rocky Mount or in adjacent communities. No one connected with the municipal government or interested in the welfare of the community has indicated that the present facilities or service is inadequate and that there is need for the building of Government-owned transmission lines or distribution facilities either into or about Rocky Mount. If there is a lack of facilities or inadequacy of electric power in that community, certainly I would have known about it or would have been advised. I understand that the situation at Wilson, which is only 18 miles from Rocky Mount, is just about the same as it is in Rocky Mount. The city of Wilson also has a contract with the Carolina Power & Light Co., which company has agreed to supplement the power which is generated at the municipally owned power plant in the city of Wilson. If these communities are satisfied, and if the Carolina Power & Light Co. can provide adequate, cheap, and satisfactory service to other similar communities, then why should we spend taxpayers' money and construct duplicating transmission and distribution lines and facilities?

The Carolina Power & Light Co. has a postwar expansion program which contemplates the spending of \$100,000,000. As part of this program, the company is building a plant at or near Goldsboro in Mr. BARDEN's district which, when finished, will cost about \$15,000,000. Two units are being built, the first of which will be finished within about a month. This one unit will supply firm power amounting to 500,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year. Within another year the second unit will be finished and this unit will also produce another 500,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year. When both units are completed, the Carolina Power & Light Co. will be able to supply, in addition to the power it is now supplying, another 1,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of firm power which, I understand, is about four times as much firm power as will be produced at Buggs Island when that great project is completed and is in operation. If my information is inaccurate, certainly some member of the committee will be able to prove its inaccuracy. If my information is accurate, then pray tell me why anyone would propose to build duplicating facilities in the Goldsboro area? All of this money which we are now about to appropriate will have to be borrowed by the Government, and certainly such money should not be used in competition with private industry which is now operating successfully and is providing adequate and satisfactory service.

The Carolina Power & Light Co. is now furnishing electric power to many of the important cities of our State, to many small cities, towns, and villages, and to a large agricultural or rural area. The company is now making electric power available to numerous cooperatives at only 7½ mills per kilowatt-hour. I am advised that Army engineers have said that Buggs Island power will cost more than 9 mills per kilowatt-hour. I am, of course, proud of the Buggs Island

project. I know that it will be a great blessing to thousands of people and to everyone who lives along the banks of the Roanoke River. But, frankly, I do not want the original purpose of the project to be perverted in such a way as to destroy legitimate private industry either in my district or in the State. I try as best I can to represent all of the people of the Fourth District and I am anxious for them to have cheap electric lights and power but in passing upon the question before us, I am not unmindful of the fact that approximately 3,500 of my constituents are stockholders in the Carolina Power & Light Co. In addition to these stockholders, hundreds of my constituents are working for that company and their livelihood depends upon its successful operation. The company has embarked upon an expansion program which, as I have said, contemplates the spending of \$100,000,000, and I do not want to do anything that, in the opinion of the stockholders and employees of the Carolina Power & Light Co., will result in the Federal Government's being put into direct competition with that company or that will cause the financial integrity of the company to be either impaired or imperiled. Having listened to the arguments submitted in this debate and upon consideration of all of the information which has been made available to me, I am constrained to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia. I do not believe that even my good friend, Judge KERR, would want this Congress to appropriate money simply because some of the proposed lines and facilities would be built and some of the money spent in the district which he so ably represents. I am not aware of the fact that any part of Judge KERR's district is suffering on account of an inadequacy of facilities or on account of a lack of service. The evidence and arguments submitted by the committee, in my opinion, do not warrant or justify the expenditures contemplated. But I shall support the amendment offered by Mr. GARY and I hope that it will be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has expired.

[Mr. HARDY addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

(Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I feel like I ought to say something about this matter before the House. Buggs Island Dam is about completed. That great electric-power

plant which, when completed, will be able to serve a large portion of the State of Virginia as well as a large portion of the State of North Carolina. I have been very much interested in the construction of this great dam. These two States contribute a large sum of money to the administration of the affairs of this Government. North Carolina pays approximately \$131,615,738 and Virginia pays about \$738,411,436 into the Treasury of this Nation. Buggs Island Dam is the only great public enterprise that has ever been proposed in these two States. This dam is on the great Roanoke River that flows through most of Virginia and through all of eastern North Carolina. When completed, it will be able to develop 204,000 kilowatts of electric power and protect 150,000 acres of the finest farmland in the world; think of that for a minute to see what it means to the industry of the great States of Virginia and North Carolina.

I want to say just a word or two about this. I am advocating the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL]. This power project of course will develop power and the Government should be able to retain it and transmit it wherever needed by the Government, such as at Langley Field. That is not the question that is raised here. This power will be generated within 100 miles of Langley Field, all the power they need, and they want to put transmission lines down there and use that power for the benefit of the United States Government. That question should not enter into it.

This bill also relates to plans for the construction of transmission lines for the accommodation of three of the largest cities in eastern North Carolina. Two of them are entirely in my district, and one half of one of them is in my district. The other half is in the district of the gentleman from the Fourth District, who has risen here to oppose the proposed amendment. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas also provides that the great Buggs Island facility shall have transmission features so that they can accommodate three of the outstanding cities in eastern North Carolina. Kinston is one of them, Wilson is another, and the third is Rocky Mount. As the gentleman from the fourth district said, one-half of that into Rocky Mount goes to his district. These are industrial cities, they are thriving cities, and they need this power. The Government proposes in this bill to siphon enough power into those cities through these transmission lines to accommodate the people who live there and contribute to their welfare.

I hope very much the House will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas, because we need this power. There is no reason in the world, when the power company proposes to build it there, why we should not have it. It does not interfere with either one of the other gentlemen who are opposing this, but it does mean a great deal to the Second Congressional District and the three great cities I represent in that district. I am asking this House to support the amendment offered by the gen-

tleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] and let my constituents have that power that they need so much and that they can acquire so soon.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are dealing here with a bill which appropriates \$500,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. That is a lot of money and we are doing it in right smart of a hurry. I have had this theory about these bills this year, that in this time when everybody is being asked repeatedly by the administration to tighten their belts, that it might be a good idea for the Government to set an example and cut down or defer a lot of these unnecessary expenditures of which the proposal now before us is one of the outstanding ones. This proposition narrows itself down to this: Whether we are going to permit the taking over of private industry and the power lines in the transmission field by the Government, or whether we are going to maintain the policy that we started out with, namely, that the REA would distribute the power, but when it came to transmission of the power we would do it as far as feasible by existing lines. This proposal would build, at a cost of \$7,000,000, a line duplicating an existing line owned by a private power company. The gentleman from Washington, I think, made a very fair statement of what the actual fact is about this controversy, and that is that what is being sought to be done by this bill is to give the Southeastern Power Administration a blackjack with which to hit the private power company over the head and force them to make a contract such as the Southeastern Power Administration wants.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make the point of order that the Committee is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, the Committee will be in order.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, Mr. Chairman, we are just disposing of a half billion dollars today, so I guess it is not very important.

The fact is that I read these hearings and this thing boils down, no matter what the negotiations have been in the past, to this situation—that there is an existing transmission line ready, willing, and able to transmit this power; there has been a dispute about the terms, and the private power company has submitted these propositions: That in order to settle all the controversies, they will sign the most favorable contract that the Government wants of any contract that the Government has signed in any State in the Union. Do you want anything better than that? They say to use any contract, such as in Oklahoma or Montana, Texas and several others, take the most favorable contract to the Government and the private company will sign it. When the Government would not do that, then the power company came back with this proposition, and they say to the Southeastern Power Administration, "If you will not agree to that, here is what we will do. We will submit this whole proposition to arbi-

tration. And who will we take for the arbitrator? We will pick another Government agency, namely, the Federal Power Commission, and whatever they say is a fair term under this contract, we will agree to abide by it."

Is there any excuse for not accepting that, other than the excuse that the Government wants to gobble up and monopolize the transmission of power and take control of it all over the Nation? That brings us to a very important and vital question. Now, I hold no brief for any power company. I have voted for every REA appropriation that ever came along. I am strong for it, and I will always be strong for it. But that brings us right straight back to this vital question of whether we are going to continue to keep private industry going so that you will have somebody to pay these taxes that we are voting for every day or whether you are going to have a Government monopoly in this field. It is up to the Members of the Congress to decide that question and that is all that is involved in this thing because when these people come in and say, "We will let a Government agency, the Federal Power Commission, determine this question, and we will abide by any contract that they say we should," and when the Southeastern Power Administration turns that down, what other conclusion can you reach?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I know the gentleman wants to be fair, but I think it ought to be made clear that the Virginia Power & Light Co. has not made an offer to the Southeastern Power Administration to enter into a contract at the lowest rate now obtained by the Government. That offer was made this morning, but it has never been made to the Southeast Power Co.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I understand it has been. I have seen correspondence in which they say they are willing to do that.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The whole matter could be settled, then, right now if that is the case. If the gentleman will put that letter in the RECORD, we can settle this right now. I want to be fair. We do not want to blackjack this company. If the gentleman has that letter, I wish he would place it in the RECORD, but there is no evidence of that before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It is my very distinct understanding—I think that it was in a letter to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], in which the power company said that they were willing to submit this thing to the Power Commission or take the Montana contract or the Oklahoma contract.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Oh, that is quite different. I know you want

to be fair, but the statement was made this morning by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] that they would be willing now to accept the very cheapest rate that has been entered into on a wheeling basis with the Government, but that proposition has never been made formally by the Virginia Power & Light Co.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. What do you want them to do?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. If that is the case, and they can make an offer, we can settle the whole thing right now.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GARY. I said that the company has offered to accept the most favorable major contract now in force in the United States, for wheeling and firming Government power. The president of the company made that statement yesterday afternoon at 5 o'clock.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, there is no question but that this amendment ought to be adopted and this item ought to be thrown out of the bill.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. In view of the fact that Congress laid down the policy that these transmission lines were not to be built by the Government except when absolute necessity required it in order to distribute the power, is it not strange to you that even though the Buggs Island production plant will not be available until 1952, here they are here, in 1951, before they even have any power to distribute, wanting these millions of dollars to build lines?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am sorry to say it, but I am afraid that the conclusion is inescapable that the Federal Government is trying to reach out and build these transmission lines and take over as a government, the transmission of electric power.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to take the time of the Congress this afternoon, but when we say that the committee is building transmission lines, the committee is for eliminating a lot of the lines asked for in the budget. I told you that the Virginia Power & Light Co. charges the United States Government more today, every day, than they do in California or Ohio. That is going on today. That is the record. The committee did not necessarily want these transmission lines, but the Virginia Power & Light Co. would agree to give power only from 12 o'clock at midnight until 6 in the morning, at the off-peak time. We were not for this transmission line. It was only when we were forced to keep United States Government activity going. It will take 2 years to build the wind tunnel at Langley Field so the power will not be necessary until 2 years from now. It will be 2 years before we will finish Buggs Island. Two years before they will have this wind tunnel com-

pleted, and it will take that much time for the line to be completed. Its a big construction job to build such a line.

We knew what we were doing when we voted for this in committee. If the Virginia Light & Power Co. had done what was done in the six Southwestern States, and in California, Montana, and other States, if the Virginia people had even come in half fair, this transmission line would not be before the Congress today.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. FURCOLO. Corroborating what the chairman of the subcommittee just said, I think it is important to know that on page 2 of the committee report at the bottom of the page is the statement:

The Savannah River Basin program which proposed approval of 15 transmission lines has been denied entirely by the committee.

I think there can be no question. From the facts in the hearings and from the report of the committee, there is an attitude of the Members on both sides to deny any transmission line unless it was absolutely essential. And adequate evidence has been submitted to prove that they are absolutely essential. But there can be no difference of opinion on the fact that the committee itself on both sides was agreed in principle. Is that correct?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think it is important in this debate that the Members understand what this is all about. This matter has been pending for 2 years, and we are getting offers and propositions right up to the day of this debate, as late as yesterday, as to what they would give the Government by way of a fair rate. If anyone will examine the record of negotiations in this particular instance it will be very revealing and very enlightening. If it is a question of blackjacking, it is the case of the power company trying to blackjack Uncle Sam.

Mr. KIRWAN. At 5 o'clock last evening the gentleman from Virginia said the power company notified him instead of notifying the Interior Department—they are the contracting agency—not the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] and not the Congress. Why did they not notify the Department of the Interior? That Department is the bargaining agent, yet here the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] said that he is set up by the Virginia Power & Light Co. to be the bargaining agent. But the Flood Control Act of 1944 said the Interior Department should be the responsible agency, the bargaining agent in such cases.

Mr. COOLEY. I certainly did not understand the gentleman from Virginia to say he was the bargaining agent.

Mr. KIRWAN. He said they called him up at 5 o'clock last night. They did not call the Interior Department.

Mr. COOLEY. But he did not say he was the bargaining agent.

I would like to ask: Did the gentleman and his committee know that in

the town of Goldsboro, or very near it, the Carolina Power & Light Co. will have within 12 months a billion kilowatt-hours of firm electricity available? And yet you propose to build a line there.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes. We propose to build the line, but I do not mean that I knew about that.

Mr. COOLEY. That shows the gentleman is woefully lacking in information.

Mr. KIRWAN. The thing about it is that the hearings were open to all who wanted to testify.

Mr. COOLEY. And what interest on earth has been indicated by anybody in this great development?

Mr. KIRWAN. The REA came in there.

Mr. COOLEY. The REA?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. They did not speak for Rocky Mount, Goldsboro, Wilson, or Winston.

Mr. KIRWAN. They were speaking for themselves.

Mr. COOLEY. If your engineers had made a survey of the territory and determined that there was an inadequacy in the power available how could they have overlooked the fact that here was a reputable company which will soon have available 1,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of firm power?

Mr. KIRWAN. Why did not the gentleman come and tell the committee that when it was having its hearings?

Mr. COOLEY. I had no opportunity or invitation to come.

Mr. KIRWAN. They were open hearings—open to all who asked to testify.

Mr. COOLEY. I would have been down there had I had any inkling that they were even thinking of such a ridiculous thing as building these lines there.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now, Mr. Chairman, some of us have not been here all the time; perhaps some of us have not listened as carefully as we should, perhaps some of us are dumber than we ought to be, but the situation, as I get the idea, is the case of some private power company somewhere down South charging a little bit more, maybe a great deal more, I do not know, and I do not care—but they are charging more for electric current than some bureaucrat down here in Washington thinks they should; therefore, the Government is going ahead to build these lines which are not actually needed. Now, I ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is that what they are getting at?

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly that would be indicated by the statements that have just been made.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; and when these are restrictions on the material they will use. Permit me to say to my Republican friends over here, and some of those on my right, that if certain gentlemen on my right are genuinely thinking along the lines of economy I do not want to oppose them. I do

not know any man in this House who is more able, more loyal to the people of the country, who is more patriotic than the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. I do not know what sort of contract he has for rental over here. I live in the same building on the same floor. Now, he may have an entirely different contract than I do. He said that he paid the telephone company more for his telephone service than he paid the electric light company for his lights. I might have added "than I pay them for light and gas." But I do not pay them anything for either. Both are included in my rent. I do not know whether that fits in with his situation or not.

May I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] what the parliamentary situation is here? There are a couple of amendments pending. What is the effect of the amendments?

Mr. TABER. The first amendment was offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] to strike out the whole paragraph and all money for power lines.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How much?

Mr. TABER. Three million four hundred thousand dollars. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] offered an amendment to give them \$128,000 to build lines into towns that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has just described. The Gary amendment would strike out the whole item.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What does the gentleman think about that?

Mr. TABER. Well, frankly, I have never been in favor of the Government building power lines where private industry could do it. It is rather apparent that private industry can do it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is the way I feel. Let us adopt the amendment. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JACKSON of Washington) there were—ayes 135, noes 72.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, as I stated yesterday, I am against the Federal Government's running parallel lines to destroy private enterprise or take their customers away from them, but on the other hand, when the Government builds its own dams and makes electricity available, the Government has a right to deliver its power to an arm of the Government, especially a defense plant such as Langley Field.

The Government has acted to provide its own facilities for transmitting power from its Buggs Island power plant to its Langley Laboratory. Opponents of this action claim that the Government's lines will parallel or duplicate existing privately owned facilities. The claim is

unfounded, and I wonder if it is made in an attempt to confuse and mislead.

The Government's line will run from Buggs Island eastward across Virginia to Suffolk; from Suffolk it will run northeast to Langley Field. It must carry a load of 150,000 kilowatts in order to serve the needs of the Langley Laboratory.

The only existing east-west transmission facility anywhere nearby is a Virginia Electric & Power Co. line which starts in the vicinity of Roanoke Rapids in North Carolina. It crosses an area of North Carolina some 15 miles south of the route of the Government's line, then enters Virginia and terminates at Suffolk. By company accounting, it is capable of carrying only 60,000 kilowatts. Even this limited ability to transmit power is meaningless. Long before the movement of Buggs Island power to Langley Laboratory was ever considered, the line was well occupied with the transmission of VEPCO power to the company's customers. As a practical consideration in the movement of Buggs Island power to Langley Field, the line does not even exist.

To oppose the Government's line because of this remote, limited, and completely occupied facility is like opposing the construction of an urgently needed four-lane highway because there is already in existence a narrow, crowded country road wandering somewhere in the general region.

The company line has no relationship to the disposal of Buggs Island power. Even if it were a line of adequate capacity, unoccupied with the transmission of company power, it would still have no bearing on the disposal of Buggs Island power. Neither this line nor any other VEPCO line is available to the Government for this purpose. Despite the Government's best efforts, the company has refused to make its facilities available for the transmission of Buggs Island power at a reasonable cost to the Government.

The company has a purpose in refusing to make its facilities available to the Government for reasonable compensation. It is indicated by the haste with which it is proceeding with a line to the Buggs Island project from Chase City, a town to the north. Expecting to succeed with its issue of parallel lines and duplicating facilities, the company hopes to keep the Government bottled up at the Buggs Island power plant until power generation begins. Then it believes that the Government will settle on the company's terms, rather than to waste the power.

The only answer to this is to authorize the Federal transmission lines required to move the power away from the project to the agencies for whom the law gives a preference entitlement.

Some of the opponents of the program of transmission line construction proposed by the Southeastern Power Administration would deny to that agency the funds it requires for administration, power marketing, and system maintenance. They seek the life of the agency itself in an effort to destroy the Government's ability to market Federal power

in the whole Southeast. I am glad the Georgia Power Co. of my State does not subscribe to this view.

Southeastern's area of power-marketing responsibility is of tremendous size. It covers 10 States. Within it are 3 projects at which power is being generated, 6 projects under construction from which power will begin to flow in 1952, 15 projects authorized for construction, and more than 40 projects approved for development. There are in the area more than four hundred public bodies and cooperatives to whom the law gives preference in the purchase of power. There are numerous Federal agencies, including many establishments of the Department of Defense. There are 13 private power companies with whose systems it is desirable to integrate the Government's operations under suitable agreements.

There are now but 30 people on the Southeastern Power Administration payroll. This handful of people has made only a beginning on the formidable body of work to be done before power sales can be properly handled. Study and consultation with the Corps of Engineers has been started to determine the generating capabilities of the power plants under various conditions. The quantities and kinds of power to be expected from the plants, and how their integrated operation may be accomplished for greater power benefits, is being investigated. Other work with the corps has been started for determining what allocations of project costs shall be made to power, so that rates may be set. Relationships with other electric systems, both public and private, have been established. Negotiations have been conducted on agreements for both interconnection and the use of excess capacity in existing transmission facilities. The preference agencies have been notified of their entitlements under the law, a detailed inventory of their power requirements has been started, and negotiations for the sale of power are proceeding with a large number of them. Expressions of interest in securing power for their establishments have been received from the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, and a number of independent agencies concerned with the national defense. Arrangements to meet their requirements are being made. Existing contracts are being administered and power revenues are being collected and accounted for.

It is with the funds requested for administration, power marketing and system maintenance—activities which are collectively called operations and maintenance—that this work will be carried on during the coming fiscal year. It must be carried on, if the investment the Government has made in these projects is to be protected. The need for an acceleration of the work cannot be too greatly emphasized. Southeastern was given a late start and has been handicapped from the outset by having to begin much fundamental work which should already have been completed. The handicap must be overcome as soon as possible. Engineering investigation, rate work, market analysis, contract negotia-

tion—these and many other tasks must be pushed along more rapidly than ever. Southeastern is not only hard pressed to catch up with the situation it found when the agency was created; the situation itself has continued to advance by leaps and bounds. Under the recently imposed requirements of the defense effort the Southeast is today reaching a new high of activity, and the defense effort has itself placed upon Southeastern a further element of urgency. Where there were two Federal power plants in operation at the time Southeastern was created a year ago, there are now three. Another project has moved into the authorized category. Two projects in the authorized category have been classified as defense projects and their schedules of power generation are subject to acceleration. By the end of 1954 Southeastern will have more than 1,000,000 kilowatts of installed generating capacity on the market. A conservative forecast of revenues for fiscal year 1952 anticipates receipts totaling more than \$4,000,000.

Work on the agency's basic program is performed by people paid with operation and maintenance funds:

1951: 34 people-----	\$150,000
1952: 60 people-----	300,000

They are the people required to do the involved and complicated work of investigation, calculation, study, and negotiation whether or not the agency performs construction.

Construction work is performed by people paid out of funds appropriated specifically for construction:

1951: 107 people-----	\$1,850,000
1952: 212 people-----	4,000,000

These people design the facilities to be constructed; prepare the specifications, review bids, receive, account for and spend the construction money; inspect and supervise the progress of construction work.

The agency's basic work of market survey and analysis, rate fixing, contract negotiation, and so forth, goes on whether or not there is construction of electrical facilities by the Government. Construction and operations-maintenance are two separate activities, with two separate appropriations, employing entirely different people.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINUING FUND, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy under the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), generated or purchased in the southeastern power area, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, except that the Treasury shall set up and maintain from such receipts a continuing fund of \$50,000, and said fund shall be placed to the credit of the Secretary, and shall be subject to check by him to defray emergency expenses necessary to insure continuity of electric service and continuous operation of Government facilities in said area.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TACKETT: Strike out the period on line 18, page 3, following

the word "area" and insert the following language: "Provided, further, That all receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy under the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), generated or purchased by the Southwestern Power Administration, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, except that the Treasury shall set up and maintain from such receipts a continuing fund of \$250,000, and said fund shall be placed to the credit of the Secretary, and shall be subject to check by him to defray emergency expenses necessary to insure continuity of electric service and continuous operation of Government facilities in said area, and that no funds from such receipts herein appropriated or previously authorized or appropriated shall be subject to check by the Secretary for the purchase of power or lease of transmission facilities, except under these limitations relating to emergency conditions."

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and that the language used changes the purpose of the legislation to be considered.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arizona desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TACKETT. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I contend, Mr. Chairman, that this is a limitation upon legislation and that it is germane to the provisions of the bill, because the Southwestern Power Administration and the Southeastern Power Administration are both authorized under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, and that this amendment places the Southwestern Power Administration and other such agencies under the Department of the Interior under the same provisions and entitlement so far as the continuing fund is concerned. It is certainly germane, Mr. Chairman, for the simple reason that both such agencies are set up under the Flood Control Act of 1944, and this is a limitation upon the legislation that is provided by this section of the proposal now before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk on the point of order and say that this \$300,000 continuing fund was originally adopted by the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate for the sole purpose of repair work and to purchase emergency power for a short time so that there would be a continuation of power. Due to the fact that the Committee on Appropriations originally adopted this item and put it in an appropriation bill, by the same token I contend it can be taken out of an appropriation bill, or limited as the gentleman from Arkansas is now attempting to do.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TABER. Yes, Mr. Chairman. This is a germane amendment to the language that already appears in the legislation. While this may be legislation, the other is legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Mc-

CORMACK] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order for the purpose of making a contribution for consideration. It seems to me that this violates a fundamental rule. Under the guise of a limitation or a negative proposal you cannot impose additional affirmative duties or powers or responsibilities. The amendment of the gentleman is affirmative in nature, and a limitation cannot be utilized for that purpose.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, if I may make one additional observation, I would agree with the majority leader except for one thing. I contend that the legislation of which he speaks in a former appropriation bill passed by the Congress in 1950 was not permanent legislation. Therefore, this amendment would be in order to restrict legislation that was not of a permanent nature.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] has offered an amendment on page 3, line 18, to a paragraph of the bill which has to do with the continuing fund of the Southeastern Power Administration. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] makes a point of order against the amendment. The Chair has had an opportunity to read and analyze the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas, which has to do with the generation or purchase of electric power by another agency than the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration. The amendment contains language that is clearly legislation.

In answer to the suggestion of the gentleman from New York, even though legislation may appear in an appropriation bill, that language cannot be amended by other language which adds legislation. Briefly, a proposition in an appropriation bill proposing to change existing law, but permitted to remain, may be perfected by germane amendments, but such amendments may not add legislation, and it is the opinion of the Chair that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas proposes to add legislation not authorized by law.

Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TACKETT: On page 3, line 10, after the comma, strike out the words "generated or purchased in the southeastern power" and the word "area" and the comma of line 11, and strike out the last word of line 17, "in," and all of line 18.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas on the ground that it is not germane to the matter now under consideration and that it is legislation on an appropriation bill; and that it changes the scope and purpose of the bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Texas, the Speaker of the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. I simply desire to make this statement, that if the other amendment was subject to a point of order for the reasons given by the Chair, this one certainly stands on the same footing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Arkansas on the point of order.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I cannot see how the amendment I offer can be found to be other than a restriction on legislation of an appropriation bill. The pertinent portion of the provision is short. It reads:

All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy under the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 * * * shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

The only wording that is being changed by this amendment is to limit legislation of the appropriation for the simple reason that the words "generated or purchased in the southeastern power area" are sought to be stricken out.

Section 5 of the Flood Control Act covers all agencies of the Department of the Interior. Therefore, this amendment would merely restrict the language of this provision so as to provide that it would affect alike all the agencies doing business under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944. If there is such a thing as being able to restrict an appropriation bill I cannot see why the amendment which I have offered is not admissible, since it restricts the appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman completed his statement?

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman to withhold the point of order so that I may be heard for a period of 5 minutes?

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, we cannot withhold the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has refused to withhold the point of order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York may proceed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas, as I understand it, strikes out in line 10 the words "generated or purchased in the southeastern power area." The word "area" appears in line 11. And in lines 17 and 18 words "in said area." How it can be improper or be construed as creating legislation to strike out words is beyond me. It seems to me that any Member has the right to offer an amendment to strike out the whole or any part of the language, and this amendment is entirely in the nature of striking out specific words which appear in the paragraph.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard very briefly on this question?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. On page 3, starting on line 7 the bill provides:

All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy under the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act * * * and so on "shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States."

What we have here is a situation where the amendment would have the effect of widening the scope and purpose of the bill. At the present time it is limited to the southeastern power area, but if the amendment is adopted, then the provision would be applicable throughout the country. Cannon's Precedents Under Germaneness, volume 8, pages 2917 and 2921 states in part:

But if the effect of the striking out of such language so affects the scope and import of the text as to present a different subject from the one under consideration it is not germane.

So, Mr. Chairman, it would seem under the Precedents that the effect of the gentleman's amendment would be that it is not germane because it widens the scope and purpose of the bill.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard, to make but one further observation?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is pleased to hear the gentleman.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, my amendment does nothing except to strike a portion of legislation in the appropriation bill. It does that and nothing more, it is restrictive in nature and in its scope and therefore it is admissible. There is no question about the germaneness. No one has raised the question of it being germane. Therefore, the amendment is in order.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, my point of order is based on two grounds, one as to its germaneness, and second, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts may proceed.

Mr. McCORMACK. The main language in this provision, as I see it, is in "the Southeastern Power area." The provisions are limited to one area. The striking out of language by this amendment extends it to other areas. There have been many rulings to the effect that even if an amendment is related to the bill or to the provision of a bill which is confined to one subject it is not in order to offer an amendment which would widen the scope and purpose of the bill. We have such a precedent in the old Territories decision where a bill which was reported out of committee, having for its purpose the admission of one Territory to the Union, could not be amended by an amendment to the bill to admit two Territories to the Union. It was held in the old Territories decision that such an amendment was not germane and would be subject to a point of order.

If the bill is reported out to admit two territories, then an amendment to admit

a third one would be in order. But this is confined to one subject.

It seems to me that in addition to the other reasons, the line of rulings to which I have called attention would apply to the point of order raised by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] offered an amendment on page 3 to certain language in lines 10 and 11 and 17 and 18 of the paragraph of the bill "Continuing fund, Southeastern Power Administration." The amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] would, as pointed out by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] in his able discussion of the point, enlarge the scope of the language contained on page 3 of the bill.

Cannon's Procedure in the House, on page 12, in the last paragraph on the page, reads:

While an amendment proposing to strike out cannot ordinarily be ruled out of order as not germane, if the effect of striking out the language so effects the scope and import of the text as to present a subject different from that under consideration, it is not germane.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] clearly enlarges the scope of the language contained on page 3 beginning in line 7.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] makes a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation and is not germane. The Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order made by the gentleman from Washington on the grounds which the Chair has stated.

The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION, SOUTHWESTERN POWER
ADMINISTRATION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825e), as applied to the southwestern power area, to remain available until expended, \$3,925,000, of which not to exceed \$600,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: Page 4, line 1, after the word "expanded" and the comma, strike out "\$3,925,000" and insert "\$3,375,000."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is an effort to reduce in some small way the burden and load of the taxpayer. It does not handicap or adversely affect the program or service of the Southwestern Power Administration.

This amendment conforms to the principle stated by members of the subcommittee, including the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], a few minutes ago. It was stated that the committee did not approve any funds for the agencies except when the need was specifically shown. I

propose in this bill to reduce the appropriation by \$550,000. That is all. You might say, "Why would you want to reduce this bill by \$550,000?"

If there has been any one promise made to the taxpayers of this country, it is the reduction of unnecessary expenditures in our Federal budget. If there ever was a time when Federal expenditures unrelated to our national defense should be reduced to the bone, it is now. At the beginning of this year, when the budget for the next fiscal year was presented, emphasis on unnecessary expenditures was made.

Here is an opportunity to do something about reducing nonessential expenditures and without interfering with any part of our program that could by any stretch of the imagination or contention be considered a part of the national defense program. This amendment proposes to reduce the amount made available for the Southwestern Power Administration by \$550,000 from that proposed in the bill.

The budget request for the next fiscal year was \$4,100,000 for construction. The committee bill reports \$3,925,000. The committee reduced the budget request by \$175,000 by eliminating the proposed purchase of the Denison-Payne transmission line. However, Mr. Chairman, this is no reduction, because provision is made in the bill for the transfer of the line without exchange of funds.

I do appreciate the effort of the committee to reduce the over-all appropriation of the Interior Department bill for the next fiscal year. I want to commend the committee, because I know they have had a difficult task. Even though substantial reduction in the over-all bill has been made from that appropriated last year, many of us believe there can be other reductions made without seriously affecting services considered to be necessary in this emergency.

Mr. Chairman, there are two items that this reduction would specifically refer to. The bill carries with it in this appropriation \$500,000 to replenish a miscellaneous construction fund. There has been no definite need shown for this item. It is true that heretofore when our budgetary situation appeared to be less critical the Congress appropriated a similar fund for the agency. During the current year that fund has largely been spent to meet the cost of two short transmission lines deemed necessary.

Now it is proposed in this bill to merely replenish this fund. It is a blanket authority of funds made available in this amount for the Southwestern Power Administration to construct transmission lines at any place at any time they deem it necessary.

Now, if the committee is correct in what it said a moment ago they will accept this amendment, because they said a moment ago that they were going on the principle that no item for construction would be permitted by the committee unless there was a specific need shown. That is what I am trying to do.

I will be glad to yield to my colleague from Arkansas, a member of the committee.

Mr. NORRELL. I cannot speak for the committee, but I do not believe that

the item should be allowed. I feel that the gentleman's amendment ought to be adopted.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman, and I believe the Members of this House should accept this amendment if we ever are going to prove to the people of this country that we are going to do something about reducing the tax burden.

In the hearings, on page 131, Mr. Douglas G. Wright, the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration said with reference to the miscellaneous construction program which the committee heretofore granted and the Congress appropriated, that—

The committee had some misgivings, and I remember discussions with the committee concerning the specific use of those funds.

The agency had been given \$1,000,000 for this miscellaneous construction fund. Mr. Wright said they have until this current year never used a dollar of that appropriation. They found it necessary, it seems, to use approximately \$500,000 and are now asking this amount to replenish the fund. They want, so Mr. Wright says, this miscellaneous construction fund "back to the level it previously held, and requires an appropriation of approximately \$500,000."

If there was a specific need justifying this appropriation for the construction or extension of any line, then the Congress would have opportunity to consider the need or desirability of the expenditure.

If there ever was, Mr. Chairman, a budget year, when appropriations should be restricted to specific and urgent needs, this is the year. Furthermore this agency asks for an additional \$100,000 for plans and specifications for future programs. As it is with all agencies who wish to get funds from the Public Treasury, they attempt to justify this planning for defense needs. They were given \$50,000. They are now back here asking for just twice that much.

This amendment reduces the amount identical to that which was appropriated in last year's appropriation. To me this seems to be fair. It seems to be justified, and if we mean what we say when we talk about reducing expenditures, this reduction should be made.

Many of us in this House are familiar with the controversies which have existed over the Southwestern Power Administration since it was created by an Executive order within the Department of Interior, for the purpose of marketing power from flood control power dams in the southwest. We are familiar with the fact that the Southwestern Power Administration proposed its super-colossal program to invade the entire southwest and completely destroy private power in that area and the operation of free enterprise in the electric power industry.

We recall in 1946 the Congress was asked to authorize such an extensive construction program, but the Congress refused. Since then, controversy over this agency and its operation has raged back and forth. When they came to the Congress and showed specifically the lines necessary to connect these dams in the marketing of the power under

the Flood Control Act, appropriations on those specific projects were made.

This amendment is in keeping with that principle and it saves over one-half million dollars in our budget. This does not enter into the controversy as to the usurpation of authority given this agency, but it merely reduces this amount of money and carries out the pledge to the taxpayers that we are going to reduce these expenditures wherever we can.

We have before us for this next fiscal year a budget of \$71,000,000,000. We have been requested to impose another \$16,000,000,000 tax burden on the taxpayers of this country. I know this reduction is a very small amount, but there will be other proposed reductions, not only in this bill but other bills as they come along. A lot of these reductions, wherever they can be made, will reduce this tax burden in the over-all program.

The people of this country do not mind paying taxes and providing funds for the national defense. They are highly conscious of the continuing expansions by the planners and the wasting of money through expenditures by nondefense agencies.

Therefore, this one item becomes important, and together with the many others will help to do something about this tremendous burden. I hope this amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], the Speaker of the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is part of the same old fight. When the first appropriation was up with reference to the Southwestern Power Administration I said some things to this House and told them what I thought would happen. It has happened exactly that way. I said that in the making of appropriations for the Southwestern Power Administration we who were interested in it, who lived in it, did not belong to either class of the two that are prevalent in some sections of the country; we did not belong to the crowd that thinks there should be no public power, nor did we belong to the other crowd that does not think there should be any private power. Working together they could perform a great service to the people of this country.

I also said at that time that we did not intend to use any money to go out and confiscate anybody's property, that where a utility company had a line and they would carry our power at a reasonable rate no lines would be paralleled and none have been paralleled.

After that the Texas Power & Light Co., that I had a little brush with in about 1935 on the Utility Holding Company Act, and again in the campaign of 1936—sometimes people do not think one-party States have politics, but if you live there you find out—and the Southwestern Power Administration made a contract that has been confirmed and has been carried on for several years. The Southwestern Power Administration says that the Texas Power & Light Co. has kept every part of its contract. The Texas Power & Light Co. says that the

Southwestern Power Administration has kept every part of its contract.

The Texas Power & Light Co., a great utility, was criticized rather severely for making this contract. It was criticized in Oklahoma, but since then both of the power companies in Oklahoma, the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. and the Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, have come in and made a similar contract.

This leaves out only the Arkansas Power & Light Co. that is still against the Southwestern Power Administration. It has refused to make a contract with the Southwestern Power Administration because that contract has been offered to them on similar terms. They are still archaic enough to think they can kill public power. These other more enlightened companies are willing to deal fairly and justly with this Government set-up and they are getting along in fine fashion.

This is a demonstration in the United States of America where private enterprise and Government can get along together, both of them wanting to be fair and just, and making contracts and living up to them. Some people still want to kill these contracts, some people still want to cripple the Southwestern Power Administration. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT], of course, would have crippled and would have probably destroyed the Southwestern Power Administration which in turn would have destroyed this contract. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] is a crippling amendment and should not be adopted because we are getting along down in that section of the country. Let me repeat that both sides, being fair, we have been able to make this demonstration.

I do trust that this crippling amendment will not be adopted by the Committee. Let us go along in an even fashion like we have been and serve the great Southwest as these power companies and the Southwestern Power Administration have been doing in the past.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. SHORT: On page 4, line 1, strike out "\$3,925,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$988,750" and on page 4, line 3, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That this appropriation shall not be expended for the construction of facilities designated as comprising the western Missouri project."

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, surely all of us want more power and cheaper power. I voted for the original passage of REA. I have consistently and repeatedly voted for continuing appropriations for rural electrification. This is not a partisan matter.

I would like to remind Members that in the Eightieth Congress that was controlled by the Republicans we voted \$100,000,000 more for rural electrification than was asked for by the President and his Director of the Budget, although they had on hand and on tap many funds unexpended. We were asked in the Eightieth Congress to vote \$300,000,000 for REA, and we voted \$400,000,000.

I think the Speaker is absolutely right when he says we should have both public and private power in this country. Of course, the Government owns the navigable streams. The original intention of REA was to develop hydroelectric power and distribute it in the rural regions of our country which could not or would not be supplied by private companies. But it was never the intention of the Congress when we passed the REA to go out and build steam plants to retail this power developed at the taxpayers expense not only to individuals but even to great industries and corporations.

I have no objection to the building of these dams, but I do object to the Southwestern Power Administration, the REA, or any other Government agency going into any State or congressional district or locality of this Nation and constructing parallel and duplicating lines. I will have to challenge the statement that the Speaker made. The lines that are proposed in this western Missouri project will parallel and duplicate existing lines that adequately supply the needs of all the people in that region.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. Gladly.

Mr. RAYBURN. I stated what had happened in the Southwest, and it happened exactly like I said. But, if the time comes when the people who own the lines will not transmit electricity to preferred customers or will not carry the Government power at a reasonable rate, then that would be another story. I do not know exactly what the situation is in the section of the country from which the gentleman comes.

Mr. SHORT. I think perhaps I know my district—I like to think I do—as well as any Member of this House knows his, and if there had been any need for this proposed project, certainly I would have heard about it. Never have I had one single individual or corporation or firm ask me to extend this line. I am not out to liquidate REA. I do not want to see REA swallowed by the SPA. I think they are two different propositions. I am not out to liquidate SPA but I do not want to see SPA come into my district and liquidate the Empire District Electric Co. which was established years ago and operated by honest and able men, that has furnished all the domestic needs that we have requirements for at this moment. We do not have any Langley fields or shipbuilding yards or munition plants or giant defense industries down there that are demanding additional electricity. We are now furnished by this private company at a reasonable rate all that is required and needed, and they are offering good service. I do not think we have had a black-out but three times in the past 10 years, and that was due to an act of God when lightning struck.

The Empire District quickly repaired any damage done within a few minutes, which is much better, I think, than any Federal bureaucracy could do.

Mr. Chairman, the Empire District Electric Co. at Joplin, Mo., with its steam plant at Riverton, Kans., and its hydroelectric plant at Ozark Beach, Mo., on Lake Taneycomo, has given us ex-

cellent service. The people who own this plant are not millionaires. There are hundreds and even several thousand stockholders, some of whom are widows and orphans. These good people have invested their life's savings in this enterprise, and we do not want to see it liquidated. Every good, decent American should be entitled to a just return on his honest investment on a legal and legitimate enterprise.

Yet there are some among us who would want to follow the disastrous course of Britain by penalizing thrift, industry, and economy.

As I said yesterday, Great Britain has nationalized her banks, her coal, her electric power, her railroads, her communications and transmission system—and now in a moderate way she has nationalized steel. I have no quarrel with them because it is a remnant of human liberty to remain unimproved.

If Britain wants state socialism, she is welcome to it, though it has proved a dismal failure—but I do not think the American taxpayers should foot the bill for her noble experiments in state socialism. If Russia wants communism, she is entitled to it, but we want none of it here. Sometimes I think I should be a Communist because I have nothing and I am willing to share it with everybody.

Oh, Mr. Chairman, how long must we suffer before we learn a little? It is as necessary for us to fight our enemies on the home front as it is on the foreign battlefield.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Exactly what the gentleman was saying was the principle involved in the North Carolina-Virginia contest which we disposed of here about an hour ago.

Mr. SHORT. Absolutely. We did justice to North Carolina and Virginia today. All I am asking you today is to do justice to Missouri.

Is it not strange that I, a Member of this House, should come here and ask you not to spend the taxpayers' money in my own district? We do not need it, it is unnecessary, and you will absolutely liquidate private enterprise in that region. God help us to help our own. The Empire District employs thousands of people, pay hundreds of thousands of dollars in taxes, and we want to keep our country American.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I likewise believe in public power and private power. I have never insisted upon anything to the contrary. The only purpose of the amendments I have introduced has been to try to prohibit the Southwestern Power Administration from doing exactly what Congress has told it that it could not do.

The Southwestern Power Administration came before this Congress and asked for money with which to build steam-generating plants and a web of transmission lines, and Congress told it emphatically, "No; you cannot have the money for that purpose."

Remember, the Southwestern Power Administration is an agency for the purpose of marketing electricity produced at multiple-purpose dams owned by the Government. That Administration came back to Congress and asked for the same power-generation moneys, and Congress said "No." Then what did it do? The Southwestern Power Administration went over here and got hold of the executive manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Associations and came forth with a scheme to circumvent Congress.

Incidentally, I should like to add here that I have never yet voted against an REA appropriation or anything that would be beneficial to the REA's. I was a member of the Arkansas State Legislature in 1936, when the REA was authorized to do business in the State of Arkansas through legislative action, and I actively assisted the promotion of the program. The SPA plan called for several rural electric co-ops joining together, borrowing money from the Federal Government through the National Rural Electrification Administration, and then building steam-power units and transmission lines for the sole use and benefit of the SPA.

You remember, the Southwestern Power Administration can own transmission lines because it is a marketing agency of electricity. Therefore, the contract between the Southwestern Power Administration and the super co-op provides that from the day those lines are constructed in the name of REA the Southwestern Power Administration shall have an option to purchase them, or they can use these lines for a period of 40 years by merely paying necessary rentals to repay the cost of constructing and operating the lines.

The Congress has never given the Southwestern Power Administration authority to own a steam-power unit. Therefore, the contract provides that the fee simple title to these generating plants shall remain in the name of the super co-ops, but they are to be used solely for the benefit of and even to be paid for by the Southwestern Power Administration. Every speck of the electricity is to be sold to the Southwestern Power Administration. The Southwestern Power Administration determines the amount of electricity that is to be produced. Incidentally, they are going to produce about five times as much as those co-ops down there can use. You know what the balance of the power is going to be used for. It is to put private enterprise out of business.

Is this Congress going to tell the Southwestern Power Administration, "You cannot have our sanction to build steam power plants and transmission lines, but you can go through the back-door method and get from this Congress exactly what we refused to give you"? That is all in the world my amendments have proposed to do. This is just to make Congress declare straight-forward decisions rather than allow the back-door method of circumventing Congress and then being in the position of telling our people, "No, we did not give them money to do it. They just figured out a

scheme, and they have done it anyway against our protest." Surely Congress is not afraid to vote for or against these generating and transmission facilities.

The continuing fund is being used to obtain the use of the very facilities this Congress has refused them. I merely wish to curb and restrict the use of such funds to the expressed intentions of the purposes therefor when the funds were granted.

There are four systems of operation for the electric-power business: One is by private industry, which is the stock company, and the REA co-op. Another is locally-owned public-power plants. The third is multiple-purpose and hydroelectric dams owned by the Federal Government. The fourth is the only vicious one. That is where the Government produces the electricity and then rather than selling it wholesale to the REA co-ops, public bodies, locally owned public-power projects and private power companies, they go out and market it in competition with private enterprise and the Rural Electric co-ops and the locally-owned public-power agency. That is the only one which is vicious and the only one that I have ever protested. I do not believe that a monopoly of a necessity should be operated by the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, of course I feel a little bit timid to rise to speak against three of my colleagues from Arkansas, and my neighbor, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to say that I appreciate the gentleman yielding, that I have the greatest respect for our beloved Speaker of anybody in this Congress.

Mr. RAYBURN. May I say to the gentleman that that respect is mutual.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate that. I want him to know that in offering this amendment it is not the intention of trampling on anybody's toes and it is not the intention to do anything which would in any way interfere with the needed requirements of the Southwestern Power Administration, nor is there any intention of becoming involved in the great controversy which might exist between the private and public power advocates with reference to the operation of the Southwestern Power Administration. This is merely, I would like to say to our dear beloved Speaker, an attempt to try to reduce an appropriation bill where there was no specific justification shown in the hearings by the Administrator; and it does not at all hinder or handicap or cripple anything that

Mr. Douglas Wright said to this committee when he came before it as to any specific line anywhere. I hope our distinguished Speaker will accept that as being a sincere and honest statement.

Mr. RAYBURN. I certainly accept any statement made by the gentleman from Arkansas as being sincere and honest. I do not think there is a finer man or more honest man in the House of Representatives. But after all he says and after considering what Douglas Wright said, and so forth, the committee in its wisdom did recommend this provision.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, as a rule I do not take up much of the time of the committee, and I shall not take a great deal of it now. But if this agency, the Southwestern Power Administration, which is a marketing agency for the hydroelectric power, the Government power generated at the dams in our section, is hamstringing or killed, the Members will be cutting the throat of the REA movement in Arkansas.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. I would like to add, also, it would kill the REA movement in Oklahoma.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. Chairman, I have been interested in the REA movement from its inception. I know what a struggle we had with the local private companies to get a rate which would permit us to serve enough customers to pay the interest and loan and at the same time serve the rural people of my section. We fought the rate down from 18 mills to 5.6. I would not be so nervous about this amendment or at the apparent attitude here to hamstringing the Southwestern Power Administration if there were not already pending before the Public Service Commission of the State of Arkansas a petition by local power companies asking to raise the rates of the REA co-ops. If you kill this appropriation, if you kill this marketing agency, I am just as certain as I am standing here that more than 10,000 rural people in the district which I represent, who are not now served, will not get electric service. I shall not stand here and see it killed without protesting both vocally and with my vote.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate what the gentleman has said about REA, and certainly his feeling toward REA is no different from mine. Can the gentleman construe the amendment I have offered, reducing the appropriation by \$500,000, where no specific need is shown at all for REA or anybody else, as trying to cut the throat of REA? I am simply trying to reduce an appropriation where there is no specific need shown; not to do anything that might hinder any project where there is specific need shown for it. That is what the record shows, and I am trying to do that by this amendment.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Of course, the committee has studied this carefully. They

have listened to all the evidence and it is their conviction that this amount is necessary for the orderly processes of the agency that markets Federal power in our section.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. Further than that, the substitute offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] not only reduces it \$500,000, but it cuts out all of the \$3,925,000 except \$925,000. How they are going to operate here, there, or anywhere without any part of this appropriation is just a little more than I can understand. The gentleman offers as a part of his amendment language saying that none of this could be used in this section. That is a horse of another color. If he does not want any of this money used to build transmission lines in his district that may be all right, but why should he want to cut out more than three-quarters of the appropriation for this Southwestern Power Administration?

Mr. SHORT. Because of this. Here are existing transmission lines in Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Missouri. The Southwestern Power Administration proposes to build right on top of it this line as shown in this diagram. I say that with the tremendous debt we are now carrying, with the corresponding taxes we are paying, with the acute shortage of critical and strategic materials, like copper and aluminum, this is no time to embark on such a vicious scheme.

Mr. RAYBURN. How old is that chart which the gentleman has in his hand?

Mr. SHORT. This is up to date.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] has expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Let me say that our people in northwest Arkansas, those people who are being served by REA and those who are not able to secure services by reason of inability to get certain contracts are also paying taxes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. The power company in my city is now asking for increase in rates. There is no competition in my town. The REA cannot serve a city of 100,000 population. Just outside of the city the REA does offer competition and uses power from the Southwestern Power Authority along with other power, much of it bought from the Texas Power & Light Co. There is no request for an increase in rates outside the city limits. Why do you suppose that happens?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Simply because when you take competition out of any industry you have just the situation that you have mentioned. So if you adopt this amendment and hamstringing the Southwestern Power Administration you are dooming REA co-ops in Arkansas to noncompetition, to one source of supply, and that is always dangerous in any business.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. I desire to say in reply to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] that under the contract made between the Southwestern Power Administration and these power companies they do not intend to parallel a single line that is in existence. But under that contract when a new line is proposed the power company goes out and makes the survey and determines whether it will be economical for them and beneficial to them to build the line to carry the power. If they decide that it is not beneficial to them then they ask Mr. Douglas Wright of the Southwestern Power Administration to build that line. Now, that is the low-down and the truth on this matter.

There will not be a line built paralleling anybody; there is no provision for it in this; there is no scheme for such a thing; and the only time the Southwestern Power Administration will build a line is when the private company says: "You build that line; we do not want to."

Mr. SHORT. Now the Southwestern Power Administration has already negotiated contracts with companies in both Texas and Oklahoma.

Mr. RAYBURN. Exactly.

Mr. SHORT. And in another instance they wanted to negotiate a contract and tried to furnish power at a better rate but they could not get a contract.

Mr. RAYBURN. Let me say that if the Texas Power & Light Co. could do it economically, or the two Oklahoma companies, they would be right down there ready and trying to negotiate that contract. I know that.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. MORRIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I believe I am reliably informed as to a very important point I would like to make. I made some investigation in regard to it. My understanding is that not one dime of this money, not one penny is for new construction, but that it is to build that which has already been started. There are no new starts whatsoever. That is the information I have, and if it be correct, certainly we would be doing grave injustice it seems to me, to decrease the amount the committee has allowed, for we would find ourselves in the position of having some transmission lines that have been started and stopping them right in the middle of the construction, which would be a great waste of public funds. I think we had better be careful on this amendment and check that point. I suggest that you give that consideration.

Mr. Chairman, as to these private utility companies, quite often they make mistakes on their calculations. Some little time ago I led the fight, because it involved my home district, for funds to build a steam generating plant at Anadarko, Okla., for the Western Electric REA, costing some \$12,500,000. I believe it is about 25 percent completed at this time. At that time the private

power representatives down in my area said that if you put in the plant, you put us out of business. I told them there was no effort on my part to put them out of business and in my judgment it would not have that effect. I agree with our beloved Speaker on his position in this matter. I said to them: "There is no effort on our part to put you out of business." "But," they said, "you will put us out of business if you build this plant." Well, we got the Government loan; and the plant is being built. Since that time those same gentlemen are now building one of the biggest private generating plants between the Mississippi River and the Rocky Mountains right in that same area, and here is a picture of their plant to be built and here is an article in the paper in which they say:

PUBLIC SERVICE CO. TO BUILD BIG POWER STATION—LARGEST SINGLE STEAM ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANT WILL BE BUILT NORTH OF ANADARKO

One of the largest single steam generating units between the Mississippi River and the Rocky Mountains will be installed in the new Southwestern power station located on the Washita River between Chickasha and Clinton, Okla., by the Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, R. K. Lane, president, announced this week.

After we won the victory against private power company opposition and after we started building the plant for REA they come along by their actions and say: "We were in error about that and we are going to put up the biggest plant we ever had." Obviously it must be a good financial investment or they would not build it. So they have evidently come to the conclusion that there is a dearth of electricity; that we need more and more electricity and that there is plenty of room both for Government and for private power. Now they come along and corroborate the theory I had at that time and refute their own.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Is that duplication?

Mr. MORRIS. No; it is an addition.

Mr. POAGE. We have been told that it is a duplication when the public puts in facilities to provide the needed plants and transmission lines. No one has suggested that it might be duplication if a private company puts in facilities in the area where there is public power. We have been led to believe that there is no duplication when a private company builds a plant after a Government-financed agency has provided adequate power. That it is not duplication according to the arguments just made. Is that not what we have heard all afternoon?

Mr. MORRIS. That is something of what we have heard all afternoon, but it is not duplication, I may say to the gentleman from Texas, it is an addition, and that addition is absolutely essential and necessary to the well being of this Nation. Right now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me to be a mighty poor time to be slowing down the development of electric power because of the interna-

tional situations that exist. We not only need it, from the domestic standpoint, even if there were no bad international situations existing, even though there were no war nor rumors of war, we would still need it. We certainly need it under present circumstances.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

[Mr. WERDEL addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has just discussed the question of rates and the question of duplication. There has been considerable discussion of the matter of duplication. What those of us who would like to see the Southwestern Power Administration continued in its present operation would like to do is avoid any unnecessary duplications. We believe we have established a program in Texas that results in a minimum of needless duplications. Throughout those areas in which it has been possible to establish the Texas Power & Light type of contract there is none of the type of duplication to which Members from other areas have referred. Under that contract, as the Speaker of the House has so well pointed out, the power company assumes both the obligation and the opportunity to provide the transmission of power if it cares to do so. If it does not care to build new transmission lines as needed, then and only then is there any construction of publicly owned lines by the Southwestern Power Administration.

I submit that in the State of Texas, which is a rather fair-sized State, the Southwestern Power Administration since it entered into the contract with the Texas Power & Light Co. has been required to build a minimum of lines. I challenge any Member of this House to point to any excessive mileage of construction in the State of Texas by the Southwestern Power Administration since the contract with the Texas Power & Light Co. And yet under this contract where the public and the private agencies work together, it is possible to retain the advantage of competition in rates.

Is it not passing strange that in those two States in which the private power companies have entered into that kind of contract the Southwestern Power Administration has found it unnecessary to enter into a large construction program and the private companies are distributing the power? That has been taking place in Texas for some time and it is beginning to take place in Oklahoma. The two States in the Southwestern Power Administration area where the private power companies have refused to enter into such a contract are faced with the proposition of somebody's having to build some more lines because

they do not have enough lines to carry the current.

The question now is, are you going to give the private power companies in those States a monopoly or are you going to give the people of those States an opportunity to have a competitive situation that will bring them a lower rate? I do not think I need argue the case. I think it might be sufficient to call attention to just one interesting fact, that all afternoon you have not heard one man come on this floor from either Texas or from Oklahoma, where we have a fair contract with the power companies, and where there is a minimum of duplication, and criticize the Southwestern Power Administration. On the other hand, all of the criticism has come from those States where there is no such contract between the power company and the Southwestern Power Administration, and they are the very States where you are getting duplication. If you want to stop duplication and if you want to give the people the cheapest power with the minimum of investment on everybody's part, then let us give the Southwestern Power Administration an opportunity to go ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it is always very interesting to hear the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Texas complain about the bureaucrats as they do when they charge they are persecuting and robbing the cotton farmers. The bureaucrats are all bad and so are the Government agencies when they interfere with the cotton boys, or, I might add, with the growers, handlers, or processors of tobacco or peanuts. But suddenly here the bureaucrats are all right when they wish to build dams, power plants, or put a few corporations out of business. No wonder the gentlemen from Virginia and another Southern State yell when the stockholders of some of these companies are being squeezed by the bureaucrats. The Federal men, the agencies they run, can do this, that, and the other at far less cost than the fellow who has actually been doing it on his own account and at a profit for a long, long time—or can they? In fact, after listening to those gentlemen, I have been almost convinced this afternoon, but I will have to think it over tonight before I finally reach the conclusion that the Washington agencies here know more about everything and can do everything better than can those who operate at a reasonable profit and pay the taxes which make the agencies run. We may need more electricity if we follow along in the line of the present administration. Some folks may have to sit up nights reading those casualty lists before we get through it—yes; we may, if Acheson has his way.

But what I was wondering about was what the gentleman from Missouri was trying to tell us about these power lines

and whether the administrators agreed with the opposition here. Can the gentleman advise us about that?

Mr. SHORT. Yes. The Administrator, I think, is the one who has talked to the committee.

I do not think the people want it, and, if the gentleman would yield, I would like to read from a letter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. On August 18, 1950, D. C. McKee, president of the Empire District Electric Co., wrote to Mr. Douglas Wright, Administrator, Southwestern Power Administration, and in his letter he said:

Now that the contract has been made between the Administration and the electric utilities in Oklahoma, this company desires, as soon as practicable, to consummate a similar contract with the Government.

Then Mr. Wright, in answer to Mr. McKee, among other things, said in his letter:

We believe the Oklahoma contract is going to work and this administration proposes to do everything within its power to secure its success. When the contract has demonstrated beyond any doubt that it is a workable arrangement, and that it would be in the best interest of the Government to extend it to other areas in the Southwest, it would then seem only reasonable that we would be interested in undertaking negotiations with you.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, after talking to our beloved Speaker and my good friend the gentleman from Arkansas, and having no desire to scuttle the SPA because I do not want to liquidate the company in my district, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my substitute amendment and offer the second part of it, on page 4, line 3, to strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That this appropriation shall not be expended for the construction of facilities designated as comprising the western Missouri project."

I would offer that second part of my substitute amendment as an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair might state that the gentleman from Missouri should offer his amendment after the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas is disposed of. It would be better that way. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas has reference to the figures on line 1, page 4, and the gentleman from Missouri offer an amendment of a different sort.

Mr. SHORT. Then, if I may be permitted to offer it at the proper time, I would like to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Missouri in due course.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JACKSON of Washington) there were—ayes 132, noes 89.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JACKSON of Washington and Mr. HARRIS.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 149, noes 87.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHORT: On page 4, line 3, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof "Provided, That this appropriation shall not be expended for the construction of facilities designated as comprising the western Missouri project."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

(Mr. BROWN of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks after the vote on the Gary amendment.)

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TACKETT: Page 4, line 3, after the word "granted", strike out the period, insert a semicolon and the following: "And no additional funds from any other source shall be expended for these purposes."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] on the ground the amendment is not germane and that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. I make the further point of order, Mr. Chairman, that it goes beyond the scope of the bill as presented at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TACKETT. No. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri was germane this one is certainly germane.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard further. The effect of the gentleman's amendment is to prohibit the use of additional funds from any other source. It goes beyond the scope of the bill, therefore comes within the rule announced by the Chair a short time ago in connection with a similar amendment, a point of order to which was sustained by the Chair on the ground that while the amendment might be germane the rule on germaneness does not apply where it goes beyond the scope of the bill.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, the provision that I seek to amend provides for the construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and pertinent facilities, and provides for them by appropriation made here. The Southwestern Power Administration is appropriated a certain amount of money to be used for this purpose.

My amendment merely limits that agency to the exact amount this Congress gives them. In other words, my amendment would prohibit the Southwestern Power Administration from getting money from some other source and hiding it from this Congress. The amendment, therefore, is a limitation to be sure that the Southwestern Power Administration uses only the money that this Congress gives them. It certainly is germane and it certainly should be acceptable to the Congress, because it does exactly what Congress should want. We want every one of the departments of this Government to spend only the money that the Congress allows them to spend and that is all my amendment seeks to accomplish.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] offers an amendment to line 3, page 4, of the bill. The provision of the bill sought to be amended has to do with construction by the Southwestern Power Administration. The bill before the House provides an appropriation of a specific amount of money for this purpose. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] has reference to funds from sources other than those contained in the bill before the committee; therefore it goes beyond the scope and the purposes of the bill presently before the committee.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] makes a point of order against the amendment. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FACILITIES, DENISON DAM PROJECT

The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior under arrangements satisfactory to said Secretaries, without exchange of funds, all right, title, and interest, including rights-of-way, of the Department of the Army in and to the Denison-Payne 132-kilovolt transmission line.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing in the bill beginning line 20, page 4, over to line 2, page 5, on the ground that it is legislation in an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

(Mr. HARRIS and Mr. TACKETT asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks previously made this afternoon.)

The Clerk read as follows:

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION
CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, \$67,500,000, of which not to exceed \$21,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Ford: On page 5, line 16, strike out "\$67,500,000" and insert "\$62,000,000."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the budget request for construction of Bonneville Power Administration was \$69,500,000 of which \$21,000,000 was for liquidation of previously authorized contract authority, thus leaving \$48,500,000 for new obligations. The committee reduced it by \$2,000,000. This amendment seeks a further reduction of \$5,500,000 which would bring the total reduction to \$7,750,000.

The budget request for this item would provide 2,227 employees for this agency at an average salary of \$4,026. In the current year 2,196 employees are provided for this agency and in 1950 only an average of 1,605 employees were permitted for this agency.

It will be argued that this new construction activity is for national defense purposes, which allegation I must admit is not entirely denied. However, it must be noted that every agency of the Government this year seeks to wave the wand of national defense over their budget requests in order to scare off some of us who believe in economy in the operation of the Federal Government. We, as Members of this body, cannot accept this premise in every case if we expect to come anywhere near close to achieving the necessary objectives of economy. We desire to maintain a strong economy through economy in the operation of the Federal Government. In fact, it might probably be said that everything in our entire economy is related to and makes a contribution to national defense in one form or another. Consequently we must take and choose those items that are urgent and which will contribute in the immediate future to the direct defense effort.

I would like to make this point. I know that those who will argue in opposition to this amendment will point out that this particular agency has a direct relationship to the aluminum industry and its productivity. It so happens that I am a member of the Subcommittee on Civil Functions and we are presently having hearings on a number of projects in reference to this area where the Army Corps of Engineers is going to build projects. I can assure you that in many instances the elastic is rather stretchable when you start talking about aluminum, its need and relationship to the national defense. If you will turn to page 172 of the hearings before this particular subcommittee you will find a question put to Dr. Raver, who is the Administrator of this agency. In his testimony that followed that question Dr. Raver admitted

that only 40 percent of the power output of the Bonneville Power Administration was going into aluminum production. He did not contend that anything over 40 percent of the production was going into aluminum production. He said vaguely there may be some other related national defense efforts in that particular area.

In addition, you know and I know very well that there is a great shortage of many, many critical materials, including copper. If you will turn to page 173 of the hearings you will find a statement by Dr. Raver in answer to a question by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. Dr. Raver said:

We are slipping behind in some very serious spots. We have just been trying to get one of the manufacturers of steel for steel towers on schedule. He is unable to get his supply of steel.

I think that is a rather prevalent condition in the Nation today and a situation which we are only going to aggravate—I repeat, aggravate—by going too fast in the construction of some of these projects which take a lot of steel, a lot of copper, and a lot of other products that are in great demand at this time.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Was there any evidence before the gentleman's committee that the reduction of the \$5,000,000 would in any way stop or hinder the normal construction at Bonneville?

Mr. FORD. I am not a member of the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations. I did state that I am a member of the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, which subcommittee has jurisdiction over a number of projects that are being built in this same area. As a result, I do have some knowledge of the problems in the area.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. Has the gentleman had an opportunity to discuss with the Bonneville authorities the importance of that organization in relation to the transmission of power to the Hanford Engineering Works?

Mr. FORD. I admit to the gentleman I have not talked to the Bonneville Power Administration authorities. However, as I said previously, I am somewhat familiar with the power problems in the Northwest.

Mr. HOLMES. May I add that the gentleman must realize that the Hanford Engineering Works, in the central part of the State of Washington, is undergoing a program of expansion, and that it has the highest priority upon the use of what available electric energy we have and likewise needs a tremendous amount of facilities for the transmission of that energy.

Mr. FORD. The members of the committee should realize that all of the money in this item is not going for the construction of transmission lines. A good bit of this money is going for the

usual department operations. For example, I turn to page 154 of the committee hearings and find that in this request there is an item of \$1,482,746, for what? Travel. I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the committee has tried to do a prudent job in making cuts wherever possible. I think an examination of the over-all budget submitted by the Department of the Interior will reveal a cut of about 7 percent, which is the largest cut that has been made so far in the regular appropriation bills that have been brought to the floor of the House.

We have made a cut of over \$2,000,000 in the Bonneville power appropriation. I think the committee, or a least a majority of it, feels that that was a fair cut under all the circumstances.

The Bonneville Power Administration is engaged in building a transmission grid system to connect up with the new dams that are being constructed in the Pacific Northwest area.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not a fact that in addition to producing something like 40 percent of the country's aluminum, which is in very short supply at the present time, you also find a great deal of Bonneville's energy going to the Hanford and Richmond atomic energy plants?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman is absolutely correct. To be very frank I was amazed, to put it mildly, by the statement of my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan, when he said that only 40 percent of the entire power marketed by Bonneville is going for the production of aluminum. If the gentleman can name any other area in the United States where such a huge amount is going for a direct defense activity, that exceeds that which is being used in the Pacific Northwest, I would like to know where the area is.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not also true that the only place where there is a possibility in the very immediate future of getting vitally needed aluminum production is within the Bonneville area in the Pacific Northwest?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. My friend is exactly right. Over half of the aluminum produced in the United States is produced in the Pacific Northwest. We need aluminum to produce the planes. We have a shortage of it now. There is a 50 percent cut-back in the civilian use of aluminum.

It is ridiculous to assume that we ought to cut back on the very vital power facilities needed to produce more aluminum. During the past 12 months au-

thority has been given to produce an additional 500,000 pounds of aluminum.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. And that is to try to comply or to help comply with the request of Mr. Charles Wilson, head of our national-defense mobilization, to expand the program 62 percent.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is exactly right. The only place they can go to get the power for aluminum is in the Pacific Northwest and one or two other places. I made the comment yesterday of the importance of power in the atomic-energy program. Being a member of the Atomic Energy Committee, I can state categorically to the House that when we have to move in and move in a hurry on a new project there is always a No. 1 bottleneck, and that bottleneck is power. We are short of power in the Pacific Northwest. Last summer they had an outage at Hanford which threatened the Hanford Engineering Works because there is a shortage of power in the area. Now they are proposing to cut this appropriation \$5,000,000. Here is an agency, if you please, which last year brought to the Treasury in the form of earnings, according to the hearings at page 172, if the Members are interested to look at the record, \$12,000,000 profit. Every one of the items, included under the Bonneville Power Administration, is repayable to Uncle Sam with interest. This is a project which is vital to the security of the country. The committee has tried to make a reasonable reduction and there is no point now in trying to wreck a construction schedule so vital to national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. The point against the Bonneville appropriation has been based largely upon the use of critical materials. I think the point has been pretty well established that the Bonneville system is an instrumentality in creating critical materials and metals for the use of the country. I think it pretty well cancels out that argument.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Yes, and I think, too, if you will refer to page 172 of the hearings with reference to the statement by our good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford], in pointing out that 40 percent of the power is going to aluminum production, if you will read on Dr. Raver also stated that that did not include other national defense industries in that area. The Boeing plant in Seattle, where they are

making important military aircraft to carry atomic bombs, if necessary, has over 20,000 employees. There are a thousand and one other defense industries in other parts of the United States which will be vitally affected by the curtailment of this construction program. If you cut this item today, all you are doing is delaying the transmission of power from the new dams. Over half of the funds included for construction are in Oregon, to complete a power grid system. There was not a single private power company which opposed any of the items contained in this appropriation. The hearings will bear that out. It is an indication of the fine work that Dr. Raver is trying to do.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to join the gentleman from Washington and my Republican colleagues from the Bonneville area in the Northwest in testifying to what the gentleman has said, that there is a very good working relationship between all the private utilities in the Northwest and the Bonneville Power Administration. I think we are extremely fortunate in having such a man as Dr. Raver as the administrator of that agency. I would like to point out also that the Bonneville Power Administration has entered into contracts with various private utilities, that in addition to aluminum, the great copper mines in Butte and western Montana must also be considered, because at the present time we are suffering from a great deficiency in copper and we are supplying the power to those mines in the Northwest to speed up the production of that vital material.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I hope the House will use good judgment in seeing that this important agency which has the job of marketing the power—not building dams, but marketing the power—is not handicapped. It is nothing short of foolishness to assume that you can properly cut back the grid-transmission program that is so essential to the development of the power resources in the area. This Nation needs more power. In the Pacific Northwest we have 40 percent of all the potential hydroelectric power in America. If we had followed a backward policy in not going forward with this program the Government might have found itself in a very difficult situation in 1940 and 1941. Prior to 1940 there was not an ounce of aluminum produced in the State of Washington. By the end of the war over half of it was produced there.

I want to make this further observation: If you are interested in seeing to it that aluminum is produced in those areas where it can be produced at the lowest possible cost. We cut the price of aluminum almost in two in the Pacific Northwest, which saved untold millions to Uncle Sam during World War II. It will save millions more if we can only get the additional power that is needed in the area. The only thing that is holding back the aluminum expansion

program today is the lack of power. Over half of the power that is marketed in the Pacific Northwest comes from Bonneville-generated power. In addition to that, 40 percent of that generation is going directly to aluminum plants for national defense. Now an attempt is made to cut the program that is so vital to the security of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield?

Mr. POULSON. You spoke about the development of power for aluminum plants, but I happen to know that right up there in the Bonneville area they are going out and putting parallel lines up into La Grande and Baker, where they have adequate power, and where there are no aluminum plants. They are absolutely going out there to run these particular private power companies out of business. That is what they can do with this \$5,000,000.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. POULSON. I have lived there, and I know.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional minute, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I do not know who the gentleman from California is speaking for, but it is a very strange situation that if that is the case why the private power companies did not come in and oppose these lines.

Mr. POULSON. Well, there was no use.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the gentleman has given the answer to the gentleman from California [Mr. Poulson] because the relationship between the private companies and the Bonneville Power Administration is extremely pleasant, and the best of any part of the country. Would the gentleman tell the House just how far ahead Bonneville is in its repayment schedule on the construction of such projects as Grand Coulee and the Bonneville Dam itself.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. They are running away ahead of schedule. They have a surplus. After allowing for amortization on the capital investment and after allowing for interest, there is an additional surplus which at the present time indicates that those projects will be paid out in less than the time required by law, which is 40 or 50 years. They have done a real job, an economical job in administering this program; it is one of the best-administered agencies in the Government, in my opinion.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, again, and again, and again on this floor we have heard the Members plead for the building up of the Air Corps on the basis that it was America's first line of defense. Three times this Congress enacted a 70-group air force, once over the veto of the President of the United States. We are all in favor of building airplanes, and to build airplanes we must have aluminum. Forty percent of the aluminum of the United States is produced in four of the aluminum plants of the Pacific Northwest, and every one of those plants secure their power from the Bonneville Administration. We can produce aluminum with coal, or oil, or gas, but it is going to be a much more expensive production than with hydroelectricity. The gentleman from Michigan who proposes this amendment admitted that 40 percent of the power of the Pacific Northwest is now being employed in the production of aluminum. Another large percentage of that power is being employed in the operation of the atomic bomb plant in eastern Washington which is constantly being expanded; other quantities of this power is being employed in the pulp mills of the Pacific Northwest which in wartime produce materials which are used in the making of explosives and in the lumber and private industries which are also essential in the mobilization effort.

This expenditure is absolutely necessary for the building of these feeder lines throughout the Pacific Northwest to feed the multitude of plants which are engaged in industrial production. One of the lines included in this bill will extend from near Wenatchee, Wash., the home town of the gentleman from Washington, [Mr. HORAN], down across the mountains into Olympia and Shelton, Wash., and feed the great shipyards in the city of Bremerton where they are building war vessels. Other lines will go across the Columbia River into Vancouver, Wash., where two of the largest wartime shipyards of the United States operated during the last war.

If we do not build these lines, if we do not supply these aluminum plants with the necessary electricity, then surely, as the gentleman from Washington, [Mr. JACKSON], said, we are going to have to pay a considerably higher price for our aluminum, for it must be produced by power and energy created by coal, oil, or gas. There is little coal and no oil, or gas in the entire Pacific Northwest. If we use oil we must bring it all the way from near Los Angeles, 1,500 miles, to generate the power. That is not necessary. I plead with you and I urge you in the interest of national defense not to cut this appropriation for the Bonneville Power Administration.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The gentleman has mentioned the aluminum industry, the airplane industry, lumber, and several others; and other than those you have mentioned, is it not a fact there are a number of small industries which are presently contributing to the national-defense program who are confronted

with the fact of securing adequate power in order to meet the requirements?

Mr. MACK of Washington. That is exactly true. American industry of the Pacific Northwest is dependent upon power.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. POULSON. It is true; I agree with you 100 percent as far as aluminum production is concerned. But right up there in Baker County and Union County, which was where I was born and raised, and still go up there every summer, the PUB is going in there, and they are trying to go in there and run out those little private power companies. If they need that power why do they not take it over there where they have the aluminum factories and where they need it? Why do they want to run out private enterprise?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I was interested in my friend's comment about socialism. The gentleman from California ought to attend the chamber of commerce meeting sometime in any city in Oregon or Washington and let them discuss power. If there is anything connected with socialism, I would like to know about it. They are all for the program. The private utilities are behind the power program. There has been no objection whatever to the effort we are making. The truth about the matter is that power has brought more new private enterprise to the Pacific Northwest than anything that has happened since the white man moved into that great area.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I confirm the statement just made by the gentleman from Washington and I want you to know that all of the public and private power people are united in their desire to develop the Columbia River and all of its resources.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, they can talk all they want to about the chambers of commerce, but I have attended some meetings up there in Oregon myself and I know what is going on in that particular area. The Bonneville Power Administration is up there to run out, for instance, a company in the Baker, Oreg., area. They are spending most of their time up there doing that one thing, plus dabbling in politics. That is what they are spending this extra \$5,000,000 for. They desire to go into these interior points, these out-of-the-way places, that do not need the power like you claim they need it here, and drive the local companies out of business. The result is that the aluminum factories are without sufficient power.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is the time to start cutting. They can find a way to save money. I am in favor of this \$5,000,000 reduction.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I speak particularly with regard to the extension of the Bonneville power lines from La Grande to Baker, Oreg. Whatever the merit of some of the other transmission lines may be, there is no merit in this particular one, the over-all cost of which is said to be something over \$2,000,000. The lines of the Idaho Power Co. are fully adequate.

I called the Bonneville Power Administration in Washington here and asked them if they need this line. The answer was they do not need it right now but they will need it in 1965. I expect to be dead and gone by that time, and from the general appearance of the Members of this House I imagine none of you are going to see that line in use when they need it.

Mr. Chairman, I shall support the pending amendment.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

(Mr. ELLSWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the pending amendment, in fact, does not represent any real savings in this appropriation bill. We are just deceiving ourselves and deceiving the people of the country who read about this action because the funds appropriated in this section, which the amendment would reduce, are for construction, in other words plant investment. A plant investment, a resource which returns a good profit to the Government, cannot be considered as an expenditure or as nonessential spending. It is simply capital investment for the future. In fact, the adoption of this amendment very easily, in my opinion, could result in a waste of Government funds, for this reason: The Bonneville Power Administration is operating a very large institution. Two dams are now under construction. Plans are going along in advance for the development of this project for the benefit of the people of the United States. When a dam is completed it is absolutely necessary to have transmission lines available for the transmission of the power produced at the dam to the manufacturing plants, or the dam itself does not return any revenue. Now, if we cut off this money which will be applied in the construction of lines, we throw the timetable out of balance. It is quite likely that the dams would be completed ahead of time in this case, and then the dams would lie idle until transmission lines were eventually constructed. I do not think that that is sound economy; I do not think it is economy at all. I think we are just fooling about this thing. Let us make genuine economy cuts and not cuts of this nature.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Does not the gentleman agree that if we throw the construction timetable out of joint, so to say, that we may have to enter into force contracts later on to build them in a hurry, and build them much more expensively?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes; I think the gentleman from Washington makes an important point there. So far as I am concerned, if the program advanced by the Bonneville Power Administration is moved upward or downward at the discretion of the Congress, it is quite all right, but the idea of taking out one part of the program or reducing it and leaving the rest of it intact, or otherwise juggling the plan, I think is not only foolishness, but it is not economy in any way. These lines are going to be built, let us not be deceived about that. It is not a matter of saving any money, because the project must be completed for the benefit of the country. We need the power; the country needs the power to be developed out there on the Columbia River. There is no question about that. That question has been resolved a long time ago. So far as the idea of socialism is concerned, as has been mentioned on the floor here not long ago, the Government of the United States is in the business of producing hydroelectric power on the Columbia River, and the investments are tremendous. Whether we like it or not, we are in the business, and so long as we are in it, let us make the business pay. It returns millions and millions of dollars into the Federal Treasury. If we do not complete the system, the revenues cannot come in.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The gentleman from California expressed some concern over the interests of the private power people in the Pacific northwest. Can the gentleman from Oregon tell us whether he knows of any private power concern in the northwest that is opposed to this program?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. No; I have not heard a word from any private power people in the Pacific Northwest for several years opposing the completion of the power program and the development of the Columbia River. We all know in the Columbia River. We all know in the Pacific northwest that the development of electric power on the Columbia River must take place if we are going to have military security in this country. We have to have the capacity to carry on the aluminum and the atomic energy production, and so on, in that area. So, I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that this is not an economy amendment and will not and cannot possibly by any stretch of the imagination save \$5,000,000. It just sounds like it, but it is not so.

The Bonneville Power Administration 1952 fiscal year program is probably the most important program that they have presented from the standpoint of the over-all economic well-being of the entire Pacific Northwest, because it is planned to alleviate power shortages that may be, in the coming 2 years, the most severe ever faced by the region and, what is more important at this time, because it is based on a sound contribution to the national defense. In the latter connection, there is nothing in the program except that required to meet the needs of the national defense or essential civilian requirements. The full power re-

quirements of the region have not been met for many years. This has been particularly true of southwest Oregon, to which the benefits of Federal power have been generally denied and are only now in prospect, with completion of facilities for which money is requested in 1952. It is only a very few years since the citizens of the district I represent were up in arms over the inadequate power supply. This situation has been alleviated to some extent in the Fourth Oregon District, but the need for power has grown tremendously.

Such strategic metals as aluminum, magnesium, and phosphorus are in the headlines as being critical materials from the standpoint of national defense, and much planning has been done in order to supply their power requirements. I must point out that the industry in my district is equally important to the national defense program. Lumber, for instance, can be considered as almost equally essential, along with wood-waste plants, plywood plants, and others.

The population of the United States over the past 10 years has increased by approximately 14 percent. The average increase in population in my district has increased many times this over the same period, and the need for power has increased in proportion. Let me cite a few figures: Linn County in my district has increased 76 percent; Lane County, 81 percent; Douglas County, 110 percent; Josephine County, 61 percent; Jackson County, 60 percent; Curry County, 39 percent; Coos County, 28 percent. The need of these people for power is no less than in other parts of the Pacific Northwest but, as I stated previously, the benefits of Federal power have not extended to these areas. It is now planned to provide for this power extension.

At the present time there is a 115,000-volt line extending from Albany substation through Eugene to the Mapleton substation. This facility not only serves parts of this general area directly, but also provides an interconnection with the Mountain States Power Co. in order to provide a more balanced service to the district. However, this is only a beginning. There is a 115,000-volt transmission line now under construction from Mapleton to Coos Bay to Gold Beach. This is the extreme coastal area which is badly in need of additional power and which will be provided by these lines and associated substations as soon as completed. Of equal importance, in fact even greater importance, are the large transmission lines either planned or under construction which carry the power from the generating plants to the Fourth District. These are 230,000-volt lines, which are part of the main grid system of the Pacific Northwest.

To mention a few of these lines, funds are requested in the 1952 fiscal year program of the Bonneville Power Administration for a line from McNary Dam through Big Eddy to Detroit Dam and on down to the J. P. Alvey substation near Eugene. This is a major line that will transmit Grand Coulee power to the load center at J. P. Alvey substation,

from which lines are under construction to Eugene substation, to Springfield, and to other points in the general area. This line must be completed on time if adequate power service is to be expected in this area. A second line is under construction from the vicinity of Maupin to Detroit Dam, and funds are requested in the 1952 fiscal year program to extend this line from Maupin to McNary. The lines that carry power from Grand Coulee Dam and that will carry power from McNary Dam into the general Portland area are also extremely important inasmuch as they support the 115-kilovolt system over which flows much of the power that now comes into southern Oregon. Another line that I should mention is that known as the Southwest Oregon Service, which will eventually be a loop extending from Maupin, Oreg., south to Klamath Falls, then west to Medford and north to Roseburg, and the J. P. Alvey substation which will complete a major grid loop and add immeasurably to the reliability of service to southwest Oregon.

These lines are all most important to Oregon, and to the southwest part of Oregon particularly.

Loads are growing extremely rapidly in southwest Oregon, and particularly in my district. In December 1950 the load in southwest Oregon was 96,000 kilowatts. The Bonneville people estimate that by December 1954, when all of these facilities that I have mentioned are in operation, the load will be 241,000 kilowatts—an increase of 250 percent. This load must be served and I most earnestly hope that nothing will happen to interfere with the rapid progress of the program as planned.

The people in my area have been served generally by private power companies—the Mountain States Power Co. and the California-Oregon Power Co.—to the very best of the abilities of these companies to serve them. They have increased power supplies and transmission facilities, but even these efforts have not resulted in adequate power service in this area. It must be supported by the Federal system working in conjunction with the distributors in the area. It is most important that the power systems existing in this area be integrated with the Federal system because in that way additional firm power becomes available, not only in this area but throughout the entire region.

New power supplies will start becoming available from Detroit Dam and from McNary Dam in 1953. A large part of the power to become available from these dams will be needed in southwest Oregon. We in southwest Oregon are most anxious to do our part in the present national emergency, and we are using the limited resources available to us to forward this effort to the greatest degree possible. Our contribution will be even greater when adequate power supply is available to us, and the appropriations herewith requested by the Bonneville Power Administration will serve this end.

We need the proposed transmission lines, and many more besides. We likewise need more power supply, more proj-

ects, that will develop the vast hydro-electric potential that exists in the Columbia Basin which is our main energy base. The potential to serve the region, to serve the Nation as a whole, and to serve the national defense should be developed as rapidly as possible so that potential loads which should now be served can at least be in prospect for the future when adequate power supply can be made available. At the present time there is a far too great proportion of important industrial load, as well as utility load, that is served on a so-called interruptible basis because the over-all power program has not progressed at the pace that was needed. Even with the most accelerated program of power project construction, we will still be faced with the specter of shut-down industries, unemployment, and generally dislocated economy if a poor water year should occur in the region. The planned program for additional power projects can forever put this difficulty behind us because, if sufficient power projects are in operation to provide for the entire basic needs of the region, then we need not fear the period when low water develops. I sincerely hope that this program will be permitted to go forward on this basis.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see the Members from the respective districts come down in the well and give the information as to what is going on in their districts. But I want to tell you this: We are not going through any economy wave on the floor of the House today. This committee sat through 6 weeks listening to both sides and trying to come in with a fair answer. I am satisfied, before this year goes out, that you will spend maybe \$25,000,000 more in the Northwest. So, do not cut it \$5,000,000, because it will show us up in the next few months that the House did not know what we were talking about. Where are they going to get the aluminum compared with the millions of dollars that you are going to spend? In going along with this war effort you are being called on to spend billions. Where do you think we are going to spend it, and where do you think we are going to produce the things that are needed? A lot of it in the Northwest. Yet we want to cut this appropriation \$5,000,000. How foolish we are going to be shown to be in a few months. They will be coming in here, probably before this bill goes through the Senate, and raising appropriations over in the Senate, for the Northwest and all over this Nation. They will do it for many items in this particular department, in the Bureau of Mines, the Geological Survey, the Parks, or whatever it may be. This Department of the Interior is the closest of all departments, except the military departments, to national defense. You watch from now on how the supplements will be coming in carrying appropriations of more money for national defense. It will be through this Interior Department that they will carry on much of the work.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. STOCKMAN. May I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior Department appropriations how much money is in the entire Interior Department appropriations bill?

Mr. KIRWAN. There is only \$520,000,000 in this whole bill.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Will the gentleman advise me how that amount compares with the money we are spending in Europe and the rest of the world?

Mr. KIRWAN. We are spending billions over there. Let me say further to the gentleman from Oregon that at least \$300,000,000 of the \$520,000,000 that is in this bill is coming directly back to the Treasury of the United States. So all we are doing in this bill is spending \$220,000,000 on the greatest country in the world, the United States and that is being mostly invested in conserving valuable resources.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Will not the gentleman agree with me that if we were to cut out the entire amount in the Interior Department appropriation bill it would not be a drop in the bucket in comparison to what we are spending in Europe and other parts of the world?

Mr. KIRWAN. It would not be a drop in the bucket compared to what we are spending not only in Europe but also what we are spending in this country for foolish things. What this bill calls for is the protection of the forests, the soil, the streams, the mines, the aluminum. Everything in this bill is really for national defense.

Mr. STOCKMAN. If we were to save the entire \$520,000,000, that is, make a so-called saving, it still would not be a drop in the bucket in comparison to the large amounts we are spending on other countries in the world?

Mr. KIRWAN. It would not be a drop in the bucket to what we are spending on the rest of the world.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think the gentleman has helped to clarify the issue here considerably by his statement as to the amount of money that is recoverable. Following through on that line, I should like to refer the Members of the House to page 172 of the appropriation hearings, in connection with the Bonneville Power Administration:

Mr. NORRELL. After you paid the cost of operation and the interest last year, you paid in \$12,000,000 on the cost of construction; is that right?

Dr. RAVEN. That is right.

The total of that surplus to June 30—that is, for all of our period of operation from the beginning, when we did have a big investment with very little business, down to the present time, when we are using our investment just as fast as we can—the total net which has been made available to the United States Government for whatever purpose the Treasury wants to use it, but for bookkeeping purposes we use this \$54,644,061 net for retirement of debt on our books.

This is a sound business enterprise and it is a good investment not only for the development of the resources of the

country but for the security of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. KIRWAN. I am not down here defending anything in Ohio. I have said every year since I have been chairman of the committee handling this bill that all that is in this bill for Ohio is the wick on the Perry Monument on Lake Erie. So you will not find me here saying, "This is in my district, or it is in the State of Ohio." There is not a quarter in this bill for the State of Ohio. From being on this committee for 10 years, I know pretty well that every dollar that is appropriated by the Congress for any activity of the Interior Department is essential for the national defense. No bill which may come to the House for your consideration, except for military agencies and atomic energy, will be as essential to the national defense as this bill. So, gentlemen, do what you wish with it. It is your country the same as it is mine, and I again tell you that, from this day on, not a month will pass when there will not be a supplemental appropriation bill. They will ask for money not only to put back in what you are cutting out of this bill, but for more money, too, to keep this Government going.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to listen to the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of this great subcommittee, giving an all-American speech on an all-American bill. But getting back to what the gentleman from Washington has said about \$54,000,000 being brought into the Treasury of the United States by Bonneville, it might be well to bring out at this time that that revenue comes from two dams only, the Cooley Dam and Bonneville Dam itself. The third dam which will come in and which will have a Bonneville account will, of course, be the Hungry Horse. We are just getting started in the Northwest. We need this power, not for ourselves so much, although it helps us, that is true, but for the security and defense of the United States. I was delighted to hear the gentleman from Oregon bring out that fact, and to hear the gentleman's corroboration of it that this was just a drop in the bucket, and that we are spending billions of dollars for Europe, but we are afraid to spend a few million dollars in the development of our own country for the benefit of our own people.

Mr. KIRWAN. I am grateful for the gentleman's statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the House to just what the situation seems to be in connection with this amendment. There is a cut proposed here of \$5,500,000. That will leave \$62,000,000. The amount allowed last year was \$40,950,000. They will still have just as much new money which is not subject to contract authorization previously allowed as they had for the current year.

What is the situation out there? You know, the more you crowd things in an ill-considered way the more you run the cost of things up. What are they doing right now? If you would turn to page 173 of their own hearings you would find this:

Mr. JACKSON. Are you on schedule pretty much now, based on the appropriations you have received?

Answer by Dr. Raver:

No, sir. We are slipping behind in some very serious spots. We have just been trying to get one of the manufacturers of steel for steel towers on schedule. He is unable to get his supply of steel at this moment; and, if he does not get on schedule and get at least the foundation steel for us for this line so that it can be installed this summer before the snows begin to come into the mountain passes, we may be a year late in making the hook-up with Hungry Horse Dam.

That is the situation you are in now. They are trying to crowd the thing so hard that they are building up the cost and the thing is being delayed. You are going to get more and more of that because the demand is going to be absolute for this steel for munitions, ammunition, and for everything in the nature of transportation for the Army and Navy. This cut will still leave them just as much new money as they had last year, and it will still leave the \$21,000,000 to pay on the contract authorization which was allowed last year. Those folks who are anxious to build up the Northwest should have a little reason as they approach these things and not try to go helter-skelter into everything in such a way that it builds the costs of everything up and gets nowhere so far as the projects that they want are concerned.

I hope you will support this amendment and have an orderly procedure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, as the older Members know, the Bonneville project itself is in my congressional district. I am quite familiar with its operation by reason of that fact.

As a matter of fact, the appropriation for this year is not as much as it was last year. A great many people are confused by reason of the fact that last year we had \$20,000,000 in contract authorization, which has been eliminated this year, I am advised, and I think the report so shows.

Last year we had \$40,950,000, and, in addition, contract authorization of \$20,000,000, which made a total of \$60,950,000; but this year, without the contract authorization, and having to pay \$20,000,000 on contract authorization for the last year, you will note that the appropriation is not excessive.

As most of you know, the Hanford project for the construction of the atomic bomb is in this area. It uses a large block of the Bonneville power. During the last war we produced alumi-

num which went into the construction of airplanes for approximately one-third of those that were produced throughout the United States. Without the aluminum which was produced in that area we would have had great difficulty in carrying on our operations in the prosecution of the war and in rearmament, as we pretend we are now doing. So this appropriation, which the committee, after careful screening, has brought to the attention of the House, in my judgment, is fair. It is a reduction over last year. I think it would be a great mistake if we were to attempt to reduce by some five and one-half million more the amount which the committee itself has authorized.

I hope that all of you who are interested in the development of the industries of our country, in the prosecution of the war, and in providing hydroelectric power, which as you know is in short supply throughout the Nation, will not vote for this amendment.

[Mr. MARSHALL addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JACKSON of Washington) there were—ayes 89, noes 82.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. JACKSON of Washington and Mr. FORD.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 110, noes 91.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed upon the Administrator pursuant to law, including not to exceed \$40,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including such services at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem for individuals; purchase of not to exceed 16 passenger motor vehicles of which 12 shall be for replacement only; and purchase (not to exceed 2) of aircraft. Appropriations made herein to the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for operation and maintenance shall be available only for the service of the current fiscal year.

Not to exceed 12 percent of the appropriation for construction herein made for the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available for construction work by force account or on a hired-labor basis, except in case of emergencies, local in character, so declared by the Bonneville Power Administrator.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing in the bill beginning with line 24, page 5, and continuing through to line 12, page 6, on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, all of the language contained

in the point of order raised by the gentleman from Kansas is authorized by law under the Bonneville Project Act and other acts and amendments to the original Bonneville Project Act and may be found in Sixteenth United States Code, section 825. For example, there is contained in the area covered by the gentleman's point of order the authority with reference to the purchase of automobiles. This is contained in general authorizing legislation that is applicable to all departments of Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Kansas be more specific with reference to the language that he deems to be legislation on an appropriation bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the language in line 4, beginning with the word "including" and ending with the word "individuals" in line 5 is certainly without authorization and for that reason the entire paragraph, in my judgment, is legislation on an appropriation bill and not authorized.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman's contention at that point, may I say that Public Law 600 of the Seventy-ninth Congress specifically authorizes the Department to do this very thing.

The CHAIRMAN. It authorizes the department to pay at the rate of \$100 per diem?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Washington explain to the Chair the reason for carrying it in the appropriation bill itself, if it is authorized?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Unless the Committee on Appropriations each year authorizes a specific amount, they have no authority to spend any money for this purpose. In other words, existing law gives the department the authority to pay per diem expenses to individuals but the amount as to what should be paid is left to the discretion of the Committee on Appropriations, and the committee from time to time has changed the amount. I will be glad to read from Fifth United States Code, section 55a, as follows:

The head of any department, when authorized in an appropriation or other act, may procure the temporary (not in excess of 1 year) or intermittent services of experts or consultants or organizations thereof.

I think that section clearly leaves it to Congress, and Congress has to act each year for the simple reason that the authority to make the payment is limited to a maximum of 1 year.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, may I add this further? It would occur to me then it is an attempt by law to change the Rules of the House and that certainly cannot be done. So, we still have legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. For the information of the gentleman from Kansas the Chair will read from the United States Code, title 5, on page 79, section 35a:

Temporary employment of experts or consultants; rate of compensation:

The head of any department, when authorized in an appropriation or other act, may procure the temporary (not in excess of 1 year) or intermittent services of experts or

consultants or organizations thereof, including stenographic reporting services, by contract and in such cases such service shall be without regard to the civil service and classification laws (but as to agencies subject to sections * * * at rates not in excess of the per diem equivalent of the highest rate payable under said sections, unless other rates are specifically provided in the appropriation or other law) and except in the case of stenographic reporting services by organizations without regard to section 5 of title 41.

Mr. TABER. Might I be allowed to make a suggestion, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. It is the duty of the legislative committees to bring in legislation that will fix the rate of compensation. A limitation by a Committee on Appropriations can be made restricting the amount below the statutory amount. But when you come by a statute to authorize the Committee on Appropriations to bring in legislation, it is utterly void, because the rules of the House provide that the Committee on Appropriations shall not bring in legislation. This not being a limitation or anything of that kind, it is clearly legislation and not in order on this bill.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. If the Chair will permit me to speak further, of course the answer to the statement of the gentleman from New York is that the argument does not apply when the Committee on Appropriations has been authorized by another basic law, and that law itself contemplates the very possibility which has arisen here, namely, that from time to time rates would have to be fixed each year as to the amount that should be paid on a per diem basis. The argument the gentleman from New York has advanced has no application in this instance because specific authorizing legislation has covered this part of it.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands, there is no per diem ceiling fixed in the provision to which the Chair has alluded. The gentleman from New York mentions a ceiling, and then the authority of the committee to place a limitation under that ceiling. Does the gentleman from New York know of some ceiling provided in law for per diem pay?

Mr. TABER. I do not, but there is legislation to fix the rate of pay, and the authority contained in the legislation would not give the Committee on Appropriations jurisdiction because the jurisdiction of the committee is governed by the rules of the House. You cannot change the rules of the House by legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is correct that you cannot change the rules of the House by legislation, but the language referred to by the Chair seems to authorize beyond any doubt the per diem payment by this service to individuals. There does not appear to be any ceiling fixed upon what the payment per day may be. So it appears to the Chair that the language contained in the bill in line 4 through "individuals" in line 5 on page 6 is actually in the form of a limitation.

Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 5, line 24, strike out all language down to and including line 12 on page 6.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to strike out the paragraph in this bill that appropriates an extra \$40,000 to be used to pay certain appointees as much as \$100 per day. I listened very carefully to the statement of the chairman of this great subcommittee. I appreciate his view when he suggests that the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars as against millions it seems comparatively small. I am now talking of a figure that may also seem comparatively small to some of you, but is \$40,000. The item is not small. Furthermore, I do not think its expenditure is justified.

Furthermore, I call your attention to the fact that this is not the only item of this kind in this bill. There are more right in this bill. I think you are going to find similar provisions in other bills. This comes about because an act was approved 2 or 3 years ago that said in substance, persons outside civil service may be hired on per diem basis at salaries at a not higher rate than those receiving highest salaries under classified service. This is about \$43 or \$44 per day. It also provides, and here is where you break the ceiling, the Appropriations Committee could approve payments of as much as \$100 per day. Of course, all expenses are in addition thereto. I remind you these appointees are not required to qualify under civil service. They are clear outside of jurisdiction of civil service. The Civil Service Committee of the House did approve legislation permitting employment of a limited number of persons above ceilings but made definite requirements that had to be met by such persons.

Mr. Chairman, there is certainly nothing in this bill that says one word about the qualifications or requirements with respect to those who may be paid as much as \$100 per day. Here is what the bill provides with respect to this particular item:

Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed by law, including not to exceed \$40,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) including such services at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem for individuals.

Nothing there about the kind or qualifications of the individuals. Nothing about how long they may work. Just that they are to be paid not more than \$100. Now look at the report. There is nothing at all in the report of this great committee supposed to describe the contents of the bill. The same thing applies to other sections in this bill, in other bureaus where you seek to pay a few extra people at the rate of \$100 per day.

There is nothing in the bill or in the report to say how they are to qualify for those jobs. Read the hearings, if you

will, and point out to me where anyone testified before your great committee telling you of the need for these individuals and for this extra \$40,000, or telling what the qualifications of the individuals would be. What requirements would be met in order to qualify for receiving \$100 per day? About the only testimony you will find is that they may need some engineers for part-time service. Of course, they can get them now on a per diem basis at the rate of \$16,000 per year. The difference is that in the latter group they would have to meet certain qualifications provided by law.

Here you propose to pay \$100 a day and do it without even qualifying the individuals for this job.

As I said you do this thing again in other parts of this bill. This is only a start. Turn to page 12. There you agree to pay \$100 to some additional people in the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Turn to page 19 and you will find they are doing the same thing again, except there is more of it. There you propose \$60,000 for additional individuals at \$100 per day.

After the camel gets his nose under the tent, of course he crawls on in. Here you are going to hire extra individuals in this great agency of ours across the board for \$100 a day without even indicating their requirements or any qualifications. I feel quite sure this great department of government does not expect to employ additional attorneys. I am informed there are more than 200 lawyers in this agency at the present time. Here you propose to pay \$100 a day, which on the basis of 6 days a week amounts to \$600 a week. My amendment provides that little extra clause in it that you must not go above the highest amount paid under civil service, which is between \$43 and \$45 a day. I think this is fair. I do not think either the committee or the Bureau has made a case to support the payment of \$100 to the extra individuals. If this extra employment is really needed, we should know in what particular places their services are required, what professional or other qualifications will be required, and why they should not be required to comply with civil service qualifications. Requirements are set up for less important jobs. Why not do it here?

You would not give a man a 14 rating or a 12 rating, unless you showed that he is qualified. You do not qualify the people at all under this bill—not a bit of it.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. Did I understand the gentleman to say that there had been no hearings on this subject at all?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No definite information on this particular item in the Bonneville Dam. You might find it on some others, but not on this one except in generalities.

Mr. NORRELL. If the gentleman will turn to page 1756 of the hearings he will find the testimony on the administrative provisions.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am talking about the Bonneville Dam now. They are the ones you are going to have to qualify. The hearings do not indicate standards of qualification.

Mr. NORRELL. There were hearings on the change of language to give them the \$100 a day.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, yes; the law provides it, all right, but you do not qualify these people. That is what I am talking about. You do not say what the qualifications are—not at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

(Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the members of the committee will not feel that I am coming into the well of the House to address them, thinking I am an expert on these problems. Because I know I am not. We had this in the committee last year and before. The witnesses told the committee why they needed these men. Let me put this situation to the gentleman from Kansas.

Suppose you went to an engineering school and finished your course of study. Suppose you were the tops in your class and were voted the most likely to succeed and that you have something that the Government wants. Suppose your fee is \$100 a day. You are not going to go out and go on the Government payroll for \$25 or \$50 a day, but you have the brains and the ability that they want. That has been explained to me at least five times when I asked that question of the Administrator of Bonneville, and we have had it in the hearings year after year until I thought the Congress was sick of listening to it. The testimony is there telling you why this is necessary and Dr. Raver explained it, I think, through three straight years. He explained that somebody had some ability that they—his regular employees—did not have, and he is an engineer himself. That is why they hired these men at \$100 a day. How will you know a year in advance if you want him, or who you may want until some particular case comes up for action?

That is why he hires them and that is why we have to have this provision.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. You have \$40,000 in this particular item for the Bonneville Dam, is that correct?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is one agency. How many do you expect to employ?

Mr. KIRWAN. He may not use one of them.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But when you came to the amount of \$40,000 in your hearings, would it not have been well to have some kind of record that we could have based that on?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; they had that in detail in 3 years of hearings where Dr. Raver explained why he wanted that money. It has been in the record for years. He might not use a penny of it,

but with the war crisis going on, overnight he might want a half a dozen engineers. Is he going to come back to Congress and get a supplemental to get the privilege to hire these men?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Another thing with reference to this agency: That agency can go out and make contracts in addition to this thing, and hire people at whatever they want to.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; up to \$100 a day.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is another thing. You hire engineers at these high prices. That is something else we will get into later on, but it seems to me where you can be allowed to make these contracts you are just throwing it wide open.

Mr. KIRWAN. No. They have attorneys down there to draw the contracts on all these things.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And spend thousands and thousands of dollars in another spot.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. The same thing pertained in the bill we just passed here last week. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] offered the same amendment in the Mediation and Conciliation Service, where the House cut the daily rate from \$75 to \$50 a day. For this purpose the Mediation and Conciliation had \$50,000 last year and did not spend a dime. It was returned to the Treasury. But it was there for that specific purpose, that when they got up against an emergency and needed qualified men, they could get men who could be depended upon. I am not a lawyer, and I do not think the gentleman is, but the lawyers have told me that when they are in court and they want technical experts to testify in the medical field or in the engineering field they sometimes pay them not only \$100 but \$200 a day. That is not exorbitant.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes. If anyone ever sat on a jury in any courtroom in the United States and saw an expert come in there, whether it was for a corporation or what it was for, you would know that it cost from \$500 to \$1,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I called attention a while ago to the fact that you do not qualify any experts under this bill at all.

Mr. KIRWAN. No. We do not know what kind of an expert he will want. If he wants to go out and hire someone when occasion demands it, he has got a short time only to do it. But as the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] said, they had permission to hire specialists in the bill last year, and they did not use a dime of it. There was no necessity to use it. No case came up. So they turned it back to the Treasury. But if they needed it, it was there. They are not spending the money simply because it is in the bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But do we not have a right to be protected and know that these people are qualified?

Mr. KIRWAN. Can you get any better protection than that? They did not spend the money. Is there any better protection than honesty?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No; of course not.

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island said they did not spend one dime, and that is the greatest protection in the world.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate honesty, but let us qualify it.

Mr. KIRWAN. They are not spending this money where it is not needed.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I love my good friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] and I have served with him many times on committees, but I think he is misinformed about the record of the hearings. First, he said the committee did not give much consideration to this matter. If he will look at page 1756, part 2 of the hearings, he will see that the committee went into this matter very thoroughly. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] gave very careful consideration to it. Starting on page 1758 the gentleman will find a detailed justification of the \$100 per diem item, which the gentleman now seeks to strike out along with other language.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. This is one item that we went into very thoroughly, and the reason we took the action we did was to place the technicians hired on a special basis, on the same basis as the Corps of Army Engineers, for instance.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman is correct. It is a standard provision that applies to other items in the appropriation bill, where the services of outstanding professional people are required.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not a fact that about 70 percent of the money used for this purpose is to hire accountants to disclose rate structures for the benefit of the private utility companies?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I understand that a substantial part of it is used for the purpose of financial audit by a firm of private accountants such as Arthur Anderson Co., of Chicago. Not only that, but in the Pacific Northwest they are building some of the biggest transmission grid lines that have ever been built, and they must hire, from time to time, men from private engineering consulting firms, from the universities, and eminent electrical engineers who have specific specialized knowledge in this field.

Not only that, but Bonneville Power makes available their engineers to the private utilities to work out very difficult engineering problems. Just the other day, last week in fact, the Bonneville Power Administration laid a cable in the San Juan Islands, State of Washington, the longest cable that has ever been laid under water for the amount of power that will be carried by that cable. It required the hiring of professional people

by private engineering companies to make sure that an efficient job was done.

When you are building dams like Grand Coulee, the largest dam in the world, the Bonneville Power Administration and the Bureau of Reclamation would be condemned by the Congress of the United States if they did not hire competent engineers to do the job of designing the dam and transmission facilities. If it is prudent for private power qualified, professional assistance, it follows that it is equally prudent for the Federal Government to do so. If, however, the Government had not been careful and a line broke down and they had a request in here for some funds to take care of the loss then Congress would ask: "Why did they not go out and get a good man from private industry who knew something about the job that had to be done?" It seems to me we went into this very carefully under the able questioning of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL]. This is the same standard provision that applies in the case of the Army engineers.

I hope that under all the circumstances the Committee will vote the amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REES of Kansas) there were—ayes 57, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

VERMONT AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to transfer and convey to the Vermont Agricultural College, a State-owned corporation, upon acceptance by said agricultural college, without cost, the real property comprising 942.42 acres, more or less, of the United States Morgan Horse Farm located in Addison County, town of Weybridge, Vt., and such of the personal property of this station as may be agreed upon, in writing, by the Secretary of Agriculture and the dean of the Vermont Agricultural College. Such real and personal property and research records shall be transferred upon the express condition that they shall be used by the Vermont Agricultural College for the benefit of agricul-

ture for such period as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the said college at the time of transfer. Deeds to the property conveyed pursuant to this act shall contain a reservation to the United States of all gas, oil, coal, and other minerals and all fissionable materials as may be found in such lands and the right to the use of the lands for extracting and removing same.

The authority herein contained shall expire on June 30, 1951, unless, prior to such expiration date, the dean of the Vermont Agricultural College shall have notified the Secretary of Agriculture of the acceptance of the lands and other property of the station under the terms of this act.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to transfer and convey to the Vermont Agricultural College, a State-owned corporation, upon acceptance by said agricultural college, without cost, the real property comprising nine hundred forty-two and forty-two one-hundredths acres, more or less, of the United States Morgan Horse Farm located in Addison County, town of Weybridge, Vt., and such of the personal property of this station as may be agreed upon, in writing, by the Secretary of Agriculture and the dean of the Vermont Agricultural College. Such real and personal property and research records shall be transferred upon the express condition that they shall be used by the Vermont Agricultural College for the benefit of agriculture for such period as may be agreed upon by the Secretary, and the said college at the time of transfer. Deeds to the property conveyed pursuant to this act shall contain (1) a provision providing that the property shall revert to the United States if the property is used for any purpose other than for the benefit of agriculture, and (2) a reservation to the United States of all gas, oil, coal, and other minerals and fissionable materials as may be found in such lands and the right to use the lands for extracting and removing same.

"The authority herein contained shall expire on June 30, 1951, unless, prior to such expiration date, the dean of the Vermont Agricultural College shall have notified the Secretary of Agriculture of the acceptance of the lands and other property of the station under the terms of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill, H. R. 6392.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

VIEWS OF EARL COCKE, JR., NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, if there is any segment of our population in a position to speak for the American people, it is those men and women who followed the Stars and Stripes through two world wars, many of whom are again serving their country in the so-called police action in Korea.

These veterans represent a true cross-section of the American people for they are from all walks in life, various religious faiths and racial origins, as well as being Democrats and Republicans.

These veterans are organized into several great veteran organizations that have a combined membership of nearly 9,000,000 citizens.

In Tampa, Fla., on April 23, Erle Cocke, Jr., national commander of the American Legion reflected the views of millions of American citizens when he said:

Military decisions must govern the methods and tactics of defeating the enemy. This is no job for swivel chair politicians or striped-pants diplomats. This is a job for soldiers.

Today here in Washington Commander in Chief Charles C. Ralls, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, reinforced the words of the national Legion commander when he demanded the replacement of Secretary of State Dean Acheson with a successor who can command the genuine support of both Democrats and Republicans as a necessary prelude to the reestablishment of a bipartisan policy.

In asking President Truman to dismiss Dean Acheson, Commander in Chief Ralls said:

The current conflict of opinions between Congress and the State Department and Acheson's manifest inability to win the support of the American people have produced a degree of disunity that strikes at the very foundation of our hopes for victory over the communist menace to world peace.

Commander Ralls continued by saying:

Soviet Russia has always employed the divide and conquer technique to destroy its enemies. As long as we remain divided on our foreign principles and objectives, we are guilty of giving aid and comfort to our Communist enemies—

He said.

The national leader of the VFW declared that millions of Americans have clearly indicated their lack of confidence in Secretary Acheson and he said this attitude will continue to handcuff the Nation's effort to combat aggression on all fronts as long as Mr. Acheson remains head of our State Department.

Mr. Speaker, the statements by the national commanders of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars are not emotional outbursts resulting from the Truman-MacArthur controversy. Their statements are based on actions taken at their national conventions, assembled last year, when they condemned the policies of the Department of State which they declared were endangering the very existence of our beloved country.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with these two great veteran leaders that Dean Acheson

should be removed immediately. In the minds of millions of Americans he is a symbol of disunity. Recent polls of public opinion reveal the undeniable fact that a great percentage of the American people have lost faith in Dean Acheson. Therefore, as long as he remains in office, the American people can expect nothing but bitter controversies, political dissensions, and continued confusion in our efforts to meet the challenge of world communism.

Dean Acheson did not turn his back on Alger Hiss—it is the time for the American people to turn their backs on Dean Acheson—the symbol of disunity.

TREATMENT OF POWERS OF APPOINTMENT FOR ESTATE AND GIFT TAX PURPOSES

Mr. LYLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 206, Rept. No. 374), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2084) relating to the treatment of powers of appointment for estate and gift tax purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by the direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

DISPLACED PERSONS ACT OF 1948

Mr. MITCHELL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 207, Rept. No. 375), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3576) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. MCCARTHY (at the request of Mr. MITCHELL) was given permission to file a minority report on H. R. 3283.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

CONTROL OF MARGINS ON COMMODITY EXCHANGES

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, some time ago on the House floor, an exchange took place in which an attempt was made to fix party responsibility for the defeat of a provision in the original draft of the Defense Production Act which would have given the President the authority to fix margin requirements for trading on the commodity exchanges.

During that discussion, familiar charges were repeated about speculation on the commodity exchanges and the conclusion was drawn that this speculation was a factor in increasing commodity prices and the cost of living.

Without saying whether Democrats or Republicans were responsible for the defeat of the effort to increase the Government's authority over the commodity exchanges, I want to say that I supported the amendment to the Defense Production Act for deletion of the commodity exchange provision. I did so after considered judgment and I would do so again under similar circumstances.

Bear in mind please, that the proposal we are talking about was not a proposal to put the commodity exchanges out of business because of the speculation which takes place on them. Nobody, so far as I know, has said that the commodity exchanges should be closed. On the contrary, even the Department of Agriculture, which has been the principal proponent for control of margins for futures trading on the exchanges, agrees that the exchanges serve a useful purpose. This is attested by many statements from Department officials. The question comes down to the advisability of giving the Government more power over the exchanges, including giving the Government the authority to raise margins, or lower margins, on the theory that speculation does have a vital influence upon commodity prices.

Chief Justice Taft, in delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of *the United States v. The New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange, Inc.* (263 U. S. 611) said:

The usefulness and legality of sales for future delivery, and of furnishing an exchange where under well-defined limitations and the rules the business can be carried on, have been fully recognized by this court. * * * Those who have studied the economic effect of such exchanges for contracts for future deliveries generally agree that they stabilize prices in the long run instead of promoting their fluctuation.

Like William Howard Taft, I maintain that the rise or fall of commodity prices, for any but very brief periods, simply reflects market conditions. In a free market, prices cannot but reflect supply and demand. The exchanges simply mirror these prices.

What then is the function of the commodity exchanges? They serve two primary purposes:

First. They show accurately what prices are from hour to hour and day to day.

Second. They serve as insurance for the elements of an industry which does not wish to speculate, but which wish to make their profits out of the services they perform.

The advantage of a place where anyone interested can readily obtain accurate and up-to-date information on commodity prices should not have to be spelled out.

If there is any question about the importance of this function of the exchanges, I refer you only to the recent experience on the cotton exchanges. The general ceiling price regulation, issued on January 26, resulted in the closing of the cotton exchanges until March 8. The cotton exchanges opened on March 8 following the issuance by OPS of specific price ceilings on upland cotton and a supplementary regulation which fixed ceilings for futures trading.

During the period from January 26 to March 8 the entire cotton trade was paralyzed. The general price ceiling was such that no one knew what the price of cotton was supposed to be. The producers of cotton could not sell their cotton; merchants could not quote prices to mills, nor mills to their purchasers. The holders of contracts on the exchanges could not fulfill their contracts. Everything was at a standstill until the exchanges opened.

The exchanges now are doing their best to function but, as the cotton industry informed OPS, it is difficult for any industry to function in a Government strait-jacket. I am of the opinion that price ceilings on raw cotton and some other agricultural commodities will prove unworkable and eventually will be lifted. Meanwhile, the ceilings will have failed in their primary purpose of preventing inflation and much damage will have resulted to the industries affected.

It, however, is not my purpose today to discuss price ceilings on agricultural commodities. I intend to confine myself primarily to the proposal recently talked about on the House floor—the proposal to give the Government the authority to fix margins for trading on the exchanges, and to explain the reasons for my attitude.

As I have stated, the recent experience with the cotton exchanges has demonstrated the purpose which the exchanges serve as the authentic source of price information. Before leaving this point I would like also to state what happened in World War I. The cotton exchanges closed after war began and remained closed for several months. During this period, prices of cotton varied widely over the Cotton Belt. They even varied from locality to locality. With the exchanges closed, nobody knew what prices were.

Now let me return to the second of the primary purposes of a commodity market—to serve as insurance for the elements of the industry which does not wish to speculate.

Let me illustrate how this insurance works. It is called hedging. For example, a grain merchant buys wheat from producers and sells an equivalent amount of wheat in the futures market. When he sells the wheat he bought from farmers, he buys back his futures contract, thus closing out the transaction.

of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY]. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] has long been at work on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be corrected to show his name instead of that of the gentleman from New Mexico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas, Mr. LUCAS, be given leave of absence for 1 week, to attend to official duties in connection with the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy at West Point, of which he is a member.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a correction in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 24. In my remarks on page 4402, column 2, line 10, the figure used was \$1,131,615,783 and not "\$131,615,738" as printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted to me for Monday next be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 3842) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 377), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point or order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 35]

Anfuso	Gossett	Morrison
Bakewell	Harden	Multer
Bonner	Hart	Murray, Wis.
Bramblett	Heffernan	Powell
Brehm	Heller	Rains
Buchanan	Hinshaw	Rivers
Eudge	Holifield	Roosevelt
Cannon	Irving	Sabath
Celler	Javits	Sadiak
Cooley	Jonas	St. George
Coudert	Jones	Scrivner
Dawson	Hamilton C.	Sheehan
Dingell	Kennedy	Simpson, Pa.
Dollinger	Kersten, Wis.	Spence
Dolliver	Kilburn	Sutton
Doyle	Klein	Winstead
Fine	Lucas	Wolcott
Forand	Magee	Woodruff
Gillette	Marrow	Yates
Gore	Miller, N. Y.	Yorty

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). On this roll call 369 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3790, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read down to and including line 19 on page 6 of the bill. Are there further amendments to this section?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 6, line 3, strike out "\$40,000" and insert "\$20,000," and on line 5 strike out "\$100" and insert "\$50."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this discussion picks up where we left off yesterday with regard to the policy of the administration to put in these various appropriation bills, provisos whereby extra individuals may be employed by the heads of Government bureaus for as much as \$100 per day. Of course, this applies to only one bureau, that of Bonneville Dam. Yesterday I tried to get the committee to strike this provision entirely out of the bill. We lacked two votes from securing a majority to do it. I want to call your attention to the fact that there are no qualification requirements of any kind set up in this bill. There are no qualifications indicated at all on the report on the bill with respect to who would be employed. The field is wide open.

Of course, the committee will tell you that it is for the purpose of employing specialists of some kind or other. It is rather interesting, however, to note that you deemed it necessary to hire extra individuals in the Mediation Board. They are not engineers, of course, but I assume they are supposed to be experts in some other field.

In any event, this matter was pretty well discussed when a similar proposal appeared in the Labor and Federal Security bill that passed the House a few days ago. In that bill it was proposed that extra employees at \$100 per day were needed for the Mediation Board. Now you find them here in this particular section of the bill, which deals with the Bonneville Power Administration. Further on in the bill, you will find a similar provision for again in the Bureau of Indian Affairs where they want to pay a number of them \$100 a day. Later on you will find them again being covered by a provision for \$60,000 in another bureau of this agency. This comes about by reason of, and it was reported by the gentleman from Washington yesterday, legislation which was approved by the Congress 2 years ago whereby individuals could be employed by the day or on a per diem at a rate in line with the highest amount paid in the Civil Service. It contains a provision, however, that if the Committee on Appropriations sees fit to bring in legislation, then it may do so and hike the extra payment up to \$100 a day. Now, there are no qualifications at all specified here and the employees will be outside of the Civil Service. The bureau chief can hire anybody he wants to employ for as long as he wants to employ them. Under the statute I just mentioned, if it were not for this extra proviso, they would be paid not more than an amount between \$43 and \$45 a day.

All I am asking you to do here is to pay them not over \$50 a day instead of \$100 as provided in this bill. They have given no good and sufficient reasons as to why they need to employ these extra people with no required qualifications.

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Montana, who is quite familiar with this problem.

Mr. D'EWARD. I would like to give a specific example of the working of this law. I have in my district a small irrigation project that is just barely able to pay its way. The Bureau of Reclamation saw fit to send in a group of these specialists. They completely swamped their accounts. They were sent in without any request on the part of this small irrigation district and they insisted that the irrigation district pay their expenses at this per diem rate, with the result that they could not meet their accounts with the Government. They ought not to be sending these men in without a request from the district in which they are going to work.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman. I am in accord with what the gentleman says. Furthermore, you will find a similar proposal in the Bureau of Reclamation. At the proper time when we reach that section in this bill where \$40,000 is allocated for similar purpose, I shall offer a motion to strike out \$40,000 and make it \$20,000 and limit those extra employees to not more than \$50 instead of \$100 a day. I think that is fair. I believe you ought to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, out of this sum of \$40,000 requested by this department, about \$20,000 or more of it goes for the auditing of the books of the Bonneville Power Administration. This is for the purpose of hiring the finest kind of auditors to check the records and thus to provide information wanted by private utilities. That first \$20,000 goes to see that the public utilities are given a fair and a square deal. Let us see what is to be done with the other \$20,000. This Congress is appropriating millions of dollars to try to find out how you can recover manganese from slag. I am just giving you this as one example, let us say, exhibit A.

Now the men employed in the civil service by the Government do not get the kind of money to recruit the best specialists. In the steel plants and in the other industrial plants, such as electrical manufacturers, they have the type of engineers who have been watching that work all their lives, and you cannot hire one of those men unless you pay them at least \$100 a day. That is what the Government is asking for Bonneville. If you are going to spend millions and millions of dollars erecting plants for the recovery of manganese from slag that we cannot get today from Russia, why cut down what we need to hire an engineer who has to be paid \$100 a day?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. There is nothing in this bill that says anything about engineers or anybody else, or anything in respect to the qualifications of the individuals you would employ. You simply say you will employ individuals at \$100 per day. You do the same thing over in the Bureau of Indian Affairs. They are not out looking for manganese. You are doing the same thing in Reclamation. It is a sort of policy that you are putting over here.

Mr. KIRWAN. It is in the bill appropriating for hospitalization of veterans. This type of expenditures was probably cut there. If we do not have a little honesty in Government I do not know what we are going to do. We in Congress are not running the daily operations of this Government, we are only appropriating for it. It is the administration which is responsible. If we do not trust them a little we are not going to survive long.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I still think if you will pay them \$50 a day you are doing pretty well.

Mr. KIRWAN. That is what you and I think, perhaps, but how about the fellow who has the knowledge and the information? He thinks differently, and he is the one who has the service that we need. We need his services. Perhaps you and I think \$25 is too much to pay, but he thinks differently. He is not coming down here to Washington or out to Portland, Oreg., because it has been tried time and time again. They have tried to get them for \$50 a day, and that is why we asked to put it up to \$100. I only gave manganese as an example. There are hundreds of items now. It may be copper or lead or electricity in this crisis, but if you think it is good economy to cut it down to 5 cents a day, it is O. K. with me.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I would say you should cut it in line with the statute passed 2 years ago.

Mr. KIRWAN. When only a few people have got that knowledge, how can you keep it in line with several years ago? That is why they charged \$100 a day.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman knows also that this very agency is employing engineers under contract, in addition to this proposal that you have here.

Mr. KIRWAN. All right.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Which is doing the thing you have just suggested; that is, trying to figure out where this manganese is located, which is separate and apart from this testimony.

Mr. KIRWAN. That man under contract might not have the information they want on something else.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Then they should not employ him.

Mr. KIRWAN. Oh, then just stop everything? Is that it?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I still say that \$50 a day is sufficient.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. What the gentleman says about experts is correct. In 1938 and 1939 you had to pay \$100 a day to get a well-qualified expert. It is simply throwing money away in trying to get them for \$50 a day. You get a man who does not have the proper knowledge.

Mr. KIRWAN. Such a man does not know the answers. If you want to cut it down to 75 cents a day it is O. K. with me. None of them are going to be employed in Ohio, so suit yourselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to remind my good friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] once again, and all other Members of the House, if they will be good enough to open the hearings to page 1758, they will receive a bill of particulars as to the need for these services.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] explained this matter yesterday by stating that the committee had gone into this item very carefully. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] had charge of this item in the bill. He carefully cross-examined the Department on this point. For the benefit of the House, I shall quote from a part of the hearings and the justification made by Bonneville on this item. If you will look on page 1759, they set out four basic points:

1. Selection of the most economical transmission voltage for different regions served by the Administration's system.

2. Determination of the extent of decreasing insulation levels of transmission lines and terminal equipments below that previously used.

3. Operating practices which may be used and system components which may be added to reduce the margin between the most economical line loadings and the limitations due to transient stability of the longer lines.

4. Selection of the most effective system of communication and relaying suitable for use with power-system operation, maintenance, and protection.

All of these problems are interrelated and depend upon many variables, some of which are intangible and must be approached in the light of the extensive background and experience of nationally recognized consultants.

B. Individual, somewhat complicated problems, where the analysis and the selection of methods of solution is facilitated by discussion between staff engineers and the consultants. Examples of this type of problem would include—

1. Technical design of series capacitor installations.

2. Characteristics of circuit breakers for high-speed reclosure operation, interruption of heavy fault currents encountered on the Administration's system, and switching of low- and high-voltage shunt capacitor banks having high r.k.v.-a. capacity.

3. Design of bundle conductors for voltages in excess of 230 kilovolts.

C. Problems which are not sufficiently frequent to warrant full-time staff members but which may be approached more economically in isolated cases by the use of outside authorities in a consultant capacity. Examples of such problems are—

1. Investigation of slide areas which may result in serious damage to transmission circuits installed in these areas.

2. Evaluation of earthquake hazards at various critical points on the transmission system.

3. Study of submarine cable service, e. g., San Juan Islands.

Then, if I may repeat what I said yesterday, the Bonneville Power Administration is unique in this: That they each year have a certified public accountant, not in the Government, not someone who might have interest in their audit, to make a careful check of their books. If we have any certified public accountants on the floor, it might be well to remind the members of that profession, that Arthur Anderson Co., of Chicago, which is supposed to be one of the outstanding accounting firms in the country, makes the annual audit for the Bonneville Power Administration.

We hear Government agencies criticized because they do not make a proper audit of their books, especially if it is made by some interested Government agency. Here is a case where the Bonneville Power Administration is trying to run its business like any private busi-

ness would be operated and have a certified public accounting agency make a fair and impartial audit of their books. Certainly that is a reasonable use of these funds.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Then do I understand that this money is to be used to pay accountants and not to pay the engineers to which the gentleman alluded a while ago?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Of course not; I do not say that at all; I am merely pointing out that a little over half of the funds have been used for this purpose.

Mr. REES of Kansas. This class of funds?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is right.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman means, then, that we have to get outside accountants for \$100 a day to catch up on a Government's own bureau over there?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I ask my good friend from Kansas to be fair about this. This is a case where the Government is engaged in the business of marketing power, that deals with private and public concerns. The Government agencies are constantly being criticized for not keeping good books, for not using the sound, competent practices of private enterprise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired. Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for seven additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Here is a case where Bonneville is trying to have an honest, fair, and decent accounting job done to give the Congress of the United States a fair and impartial report of their business activities, and then we turn around and say they must not do that, they must not conduct their business as a private utility would but must do it in just the opposite way.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I did not have in mind prohibiting their employment; what I was talking about was making the amount \$50 a day. Surely you can find competent public accountants for \$50 a day if you have to have somebody check up on your own Government. That is one agency checking against another; is it not?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. May I suggest to my good friend that the Bonneville Power Administration is operating a big business. Does the gentleman believe that General Electric or Westinghouse can go out and hire certified public accountants for \$50 a day and have a good audit of their books? Bear in mind that the Bonneville Power Administration receipts for the current year will be about \$35,000,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But you have auditors there now that you are paying \$16,000 right in that agency.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. No one in the Bonneville Power Administration gets \$16,000 a year.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But in the agency there are such men.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I should like to know the name of the individual who gets it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I mean in the Department of the Interior.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Let us be accurate. The gentleman is constantly saying there is no justification for this item. If the Members would just turn to the hearings they would see the justification there.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would like to bring out the fact that this \$40,000 in addition to hiring such experts as outstanding accountants and engineers to do a particular job also is to be used for the purchase of passenger automobiles covering a four-State area, 12 of which shall be for replacement only. I think the sum is small indeed for the service rendered.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How are the other administrative costs of the project paid for?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. This entire agency is operating on a reimbursable basis. Every dime that we are spending on this project is paid back to the Government with interest and they are away ahead on the repayment schedule. They had a net profit last year of \$12,000,000, allowing for amortization on the investment, for interest on the investment, for depreciation and so forth.

Mr. GROSS. Why are not the accountants paid for and charged to the administrative cost instead of being paid on a separate basis?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. There is no authority in law for the Bonneville Power Administration to pay the certified public accountants unless we adopt the language as it is in the bill now. They have no legal authority to do it otherwise.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In addition to the \$12,000,000 which was returned to the Treasury of the United States last year the gentleman should also bring out that since the inception of this act years ago a total of \$54,000,000 have been turned into the Treasury of the United States and that consisted of income derived from only two projects.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Yes; every dime this agency has spent will be repaid to the Government.

Let me ask the Members just one question. Here is a large enterprise that is doing a job for both public and private interests. It is selling power from an investment of about a half billion dollars. If you were operating a large private business enterprise and you were on the

board of directors and you said to the manager of the enterprise: "Well, I am sorry, we cannot allow you \$100 a day to hire an engineer to do a difficult job on a transmission line," you know you would be tying the hands of the manager so that he could not do a fair, decent job for that business enterprise. Out in the Northwest we are building some of the largest transmission lines that have ever been built in this country.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I agree with the gentleman. I have had some experience in employing talent of this character and you cannot get such talent for less than \$100 a day. It is a question whether you can get them for that.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I agree with the gentleman. Suppose they are building a new transmission line with a huge voltage, they have to call in expert engineers. They cannot go out and get an engineer for \$7,000 or \$8,000 a year to do that work. They go to the large electric companies for their engineers.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. May I add that I am for economy as much as anybody in the House, but I do not think this is good economy.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to commend the gentleman from New Jersey for his statement, with which I heartily agree. He has put his finger right on the pulse of this problem. Is it not the fact that the proposed amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas would gnaw at efficiency and at the accuracy and reliability of figures on which the general public and the private utility companies depend when looking at the rate structures in connection with a huge project such as the Bonneville Power Administration?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman is right. I think the Congress should criticize this agency if it did not hire a private accounting firm to do a job of auditing. We talk about private enterprise here morning noon and night, but when the Bonneville Power Administration wants to hire outstanding private certified public accountants, such as Arthur Anderson & Co., then the Members want to come in here and criticize that agency. The Congress should have the opportunity of getting an impartial report from a private company.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not the fact that every dime of the money involved in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas concerns private enterprise and legitimate, high class professional people, such as accountants and engineers?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman is exactly right, and if the books are not audited properly the rates may be changed, and a lot of private utilities will be directly affected by an unfair offer.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, there is nothing in the bill that says who you are going to hire or the qualifications of the individuals who would come in for the \$100 a day. This does not say who they are to be or their qualifications. There are no qualifications set up at all.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. If you were on the board of directors of a corporation, would you tell the manager, "Now, you have to hire this fellow with these qualifications" and tie him in a strait jacket?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No, but I have seen the government pay a good many thousands of dollars to individuals, not particularly because of their qualifications, but because of other reasons.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

(Mr. FURCOLO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to use so much time, but I do want to say this: It seems to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas must proceed either on the theory that perhaps the Administrator is not going to be honest about this, or that he is going to be inefficient in some ways. If we take the attitude that he is going to try to be dishonest and use all the money regardless, or if we take the attitude that he is going to be inefficient about it, of course, that means the amendment does not go far enough. It means that they should rather make an attempt to remove the Administrator.

I think we should remember that if we assume, as perhaps this amendment does, that the Administrator is going to try to use all of the money that is given to him, then this amendment means nothing, because he has a certain amount of money there. If he does not use that amount of money for these experts, then—on the theory of this amendment that he is going to use the money anyway—he simply will then use it for other purposes. He has the power to do it.

So the Administrator has this amount of money, and he can use it to run his agency. If you say to him, "You cannot pay these experts more than a certain amount," then, going on the theory of this amendment, the Administrator is simply going to use it for other purposes, so that the money will be gone anyway.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Kansas, Does your amendment have in mind the fact that the Administrator is going to try and use all the money that he has at his disposal? Do you believe that is what he has in mind? Or do you have in mind the fact the Administrator is going to try to administer this economically, efficiently, and honestly?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I understand the general rule to be that when funds are allocated to an administrator as he sees fit to use in some way or other, they usually use it up before the end of the year. With reference to the gentleman's question, I do not know how he is going to use it. There is nothing in this

bill that qualifies the individual. The gentleman from Ohio said a while ago that it might be used to try to help discover manganese, or something like that. The other gentleman said they were going to use it for auditing books. Nobody knows what it is going to be used for. There is nothing in the bill that says it is going to be used for one particular purpose, but just to spend \$100 a day. Maybe I did not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. FURCOLO. I would like to ask this question: Do you yourself think, and is it one of the bases of your amendment, that this Administrator is going to try to use this money efficiently and honestly and economically, or is your amendment based on the fact that perhaps he may not, and for that reason you are trying to tie his hands?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not know about honesty, but I would like to have some of these men in Government look toward a little bit of economy as we go along. I should like to apply a little bit of that here.

Mr. FURCOLO. Would you be willing to say that the Administrator is going to try to use this money to the best of his ability?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I hope so.

Mr. FURCOLO. Then on that point you do not know, but you hope so.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not charge him with dishonesty, no. I do not charge anybody with dishonesty. I just want to be fair.

Mr. FURCOLO. Let me ask this question: Is the gentleman aware of the fact that even if his amendment carries and these experts are limited in their fees, that the Administrator can still use all the amount of money that is in the bill and can use it for other purposes? Is that so?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, he has a big leeway. He can use this any way he wants to. If he is that kind of an administrator, of course he can use it. We understand that. He has a lot of leeway to use this money. The gentleman knows it, and I know it, too. But I should like to narrow this down a little bit.

Mr. FURCOLO. As far as the gentleman's amendment is concerned, as near as I can determine from what the gentleman has said, he agrees that if the Administrator does want to use all the money he can use it even if the gentleman's amendment carries.

Mr. REES of Kansas. He can. I just hope he will not.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I have listened to the argument of my good friend from Kansas that there is no way of knowing how he is going to use this money.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not know now.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman's logic is amazing, because he has offered an amendment to solve this problem by simply cutting the fee in half. Of course there is nothing in his amendment that sets any standard, yet he

keeps repeating that we do not know what he is going to use it for. If the gentleman wants to correct that situation, he certainly does not solve the problem by cutting it in two.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. May I ask the committee if this is not the fact, that previously there has not been a limitation on funds for these experts at this point in the bill, but under the bill brought to you by this committee today there is a limitation to the extent of \$40,000, something we have not had before.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That helps some. We should cut it down a little.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman qualify as an expert on whether the amount should be \$20,000 or \$40,000?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not think his testimony the other day substantiated that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to go back to the statute that stated in the first place that you can hire these individuals at a rate per diem compared with the highest rate you can pay under civil service, which is between \$43 and \$44 a day. So I made it an even \$50.

Mr. ROONEY. Does not the gentleman think the best sort of experts, whether they be bookkeepers or engineers, should be employed in connection with these power projects?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Certainly I do.

Mr. ROONEY. Then it is not economy to limit them.

Mr. FURCOLO. It seems to me what it all comes down to is this, that the gentleman's amendment is not going to save one penny in this bill. If this Administrator is inefficient and dishonest, it merely means he is going to use the money for other purposes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But it will save you from paying that extra \$50 a day.

Mr. FURCOLO. If this Administrator is not the type of man who is going to use this money to the best advantage, then he should not be in there in the beginning.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We all agree to that.

Mr. FURCOLO. It seems to me if the amendment does not save any money, if you are going to put any faith or trust in this man you have to allow him to have the experts he wants. If you are not going to trust him for that, if you are not willing to trust him for a small amount like \$40,000, he has no business in the world being in charge of a billion-dollar operation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think that is true.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I point out, as the gentleman from New York already has, that this committee has put a limitation on the amount which the Administrator can expend. I want to say for the record that he will not find a more able Administrator in any agency in the Government than the present

Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, Dr. Raver.

Mr. FURCOLO. The gentleman from Kansas himself, the author of the amendment, agrees that his amendment is not going to take one single penny out of the bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Not if you take advantage of it, but it ought to save \$20,000.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the full 5 minutes to which I am entitled because I do not think it is necessary to do so. We had this argument yesterday afternoon.

There is not a man in this House who can say he is more conservative than I am in a reasonable and sensible degree. However, if we ever had hearings that were adequate, full, and complete on any item of the bill, it was on this item.

Mr. Chairman, I have implicit confidence in Dr. Raver of the Bonneville Power Administration. He is a good man and he is an able man. This bill is written just like the bill we pass every year for the Corps of Army Engineers.

I say it ought to stand just as it is written, and I say that, knowing it is the best thing to do for the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it does not take a slide-rule expert to make some of the subtractions which it is necessary to make from the salary of a Member of Congress. A Member of Congress receives \$12,500. He loses a big slice in taxes and another big slice in campaigning, as well as making contributions of many other kinds, and before he gets through his income is about \$15 a day. For that reason, since we are supposed to be experts in our field, it seems to me that \$50 a day for some of the experts—and I say that in quotation marks—on these projects ought to be satisfactory. I have in mind a situation in my district where in up-State New York there was a certain commission created. They allow those men \$100 a day. They go around New York State harassing the poor farmers and threatening to take away their lands for the purpose of building flood-control dams to protect the city of Binghamton. Meanwhile they could very easily do what other people have outlined and protect several billion dollars' worth of war plants by simply constructing flood walls along the Susquehanna River at the Triple Cities of Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott. They pay those commissioners \$100 a day. Today what do we have? They are calling an indignation meeting up in the Chenango Valley where the Chenango River comes down and meets the Susquehanna and there are thousands of property owners who are going to be deprived of their properties if these flood-control dams are constructed. The dams have been ordered to be built by the so-called experts at \$100 a day.

I might say further that it has stirred up a hornet's nest in my part of the country and these proposed flood-control dams designed by the experts are the most unpopular works ever authorized by any piece of legislation which ever came out of any committee of the Congress. And they are the result of the suggestions of experts and the advice of experts.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman mean by his remarks to infer that the service of statesmen such as Henry Clay and Daniel Webster and Edwin Arthur Hall here in the House of Representatives could be measured in dollars and cents?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Fifteen dollars a day it comes to. It comes to \$15 a day and I for one cannot go along with the proposition to pay these so-called experts \$100 a day when they come up into my district and attempt to ruin the farm lands of the people of my district.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Does \$15 a day include all the tangible and intangible deductions?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot answer that. All I know is that \$15 a day is a pretty good amount for a Member of Congress to realize after some of the necessary outlays he has to make.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. FURCOLO. The country does not think there are any experts in the Congress.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That may be true, but at the same time I think there are as many experts here in our field as there are in the field where they are planning to select men for these jobs that are going to be paid \$100 a day unless we pass this Rees amendment. I would like to see the amendment pass.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. It might be interesting for the gentleman to know that New York State has quite a stake in this appropriation bill. New York State manufactures a great deal of the transmission material and generators necessary for these projects. Perhaps some of the experts that they are going to hire may come from there—I do not know whether they will come from the Triple Cities area, however.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will not have any part in the selection of those experts. As far as I am concerned, I am not interested. I am against paying them \$100 a day.

Mr. FURCOLO. If the experts are needed, which is apparently the situation, you must either hire them by the day or hire them by the year, in which case you have to pay them a great deal more than if you hire them by the year. Certainly we do not want to get these

men for \$8,000 or \$10,000 a year and then have them on the Federal payroll. In the long run, it is merely an attempt to keep them on a reasonable basis.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Let us pass this Rees amendment and cut them down to \$50 a day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. I merely wish to make this observation: That the statesmanlike services of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] are worth much more than \$100 a day to the people of the Triple Cities.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I appreciate that, as long as the gentleman from the Triple Cities can get enough votes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] has again expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment may again be reported.

There being no objection, the Clerk again reported the amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REES of Kansas), there were—ayes 59, noes 64.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: Page 6, line 6, strike out the word "sixteen" and insert the word "twelve."

(Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that every Member of the House feels, as I do, that under present conditions we should make cuts in Government expenditures wherever possible, insofar as those cuts will not materially affect adversely the operation of our Government.

This amendment which I have offered might appear on first thought to be a bit picayunish. It is simply the first of several amendments I shall offer to place further limitations on the use of funds by the Bonneville power project to make purchases of passenger motor vehicles.

My amendment would merely place a further limitation on the purchase of these vehicles to provide for replacements, but restrict purchases of additional ones. This amendment will cut off four automobiles. As I say, it may appear picayunish, but when you consider that these automobiles cost an average of \$2,500, that in addition we will have to pay \$2,500 a year for the chauffeur to run the automobile, and when the cost of operating the automobile for a year is considered, it amounts to about \$7,500 for each one of these automobiles. That is about what it will

cost the Government per additional automobile next year.

I find in this bill six places where new automobiles are provided for over and above replacements. There are 122 new and additional automobiles provided for in this bill. If you multiply 122 by \$7,500, you will see it will cost the Government to operate these additional automobiles almost a million dollars.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Knowing of the exceptionally good work the gentleman from Mississippi did as chairman of the subcommittee investigating overstaffing in the Government departments, he might be interested in knowing that the Hoover Commission, in making a study of some of these very same problems, found that while we had a great many automobiles in the Government that were not authorized, they had more chauffeurs on the payroll in many departments than they had automobiles for the chauffeurs to drive. Perhaps the gentleman could do something also to limit the number of chauffeurs as well as the number of automobiles.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I wish we could do that. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I happened to look this subject up in the hearings. If the gentleman and the Members are interested I can inform them that in this Department now there are 4,650 automobiles.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. And the committee bill would add to that number. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Bonneville Power Administration has a physical plant that was built and established at the cost of about half a billion dollars of United States taxpayers' money. It is not unreasonable in my estimation that an agency of that size should need 16 new automobiles. The gentleman from Mississippi says we should cut it down by 4; he wants to cut it down to 12. I can tell you with respect to this, as I did with respect to other items, that if you want to cut them all out it would not mean anything to me in Ohio. If you want to give them only 12 new automobiles, it will not mean anything to Ohio; but it does seem like very small business to treat a half-billion-dollar agency in this way.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The bill provides for 16 of which 12 shall be used for replacement only. My amendment just gives them the replacements and says they do not need the extra cars.

Mr. KIRWAN. That is what I said; the gentleman wants to cut them by four.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think it might be helpful to advise the Members of the situation with reference to automobiles for the Bonneville Power Administration. The Bureau of the Budget approved 22 new vehicles, 12 of the total to be for replacement only. The committee cut the 22 to 16 with 12 for replacement only. Now our good friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] mentioned something about 5,000 automobiles in the Department of the Interior—I am sure that is what he meant; he did not mean Bonneville Power.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is what I said, the Department.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman said the Department. The truth is that with reference to Bonneville Power Administration they have at the present time a total of 51 cars, all of the total being used—51 cars—in an area embracing Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, operating a business with a total investment of over half a billion dollars. It seems to me that is frugal management.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. There are no chauffeurs in this set-up at all. They do their own driving.

Mr. KIRWAN. Does any Member of the House know of any business in America, any industry or utility, that is operating a half billion dollar business, with a request for \$68,000,000 to operate it, and they only have 51 automobiles?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am not attempting to take any automobiles away from them. I am trying to leave them with the same number they had last year. Does the gentleman think by giving them 55 automobiles instead of 51 that he is going to relieve the shortage?

Mr. KIRWAN. The Budget Bureau knows what they need.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The Bonneville Power Administration has expanded tremendously in the last 2 or 3 years and the expansion will be greater as time goes on. In order to take care of new transmission lines to the new dams that are coming in—we have one huge dam coming in in Oregon, the McNary Dam, and another in Montana, Hungry Horse Dam—they are building transmission lines to those dams. A small amount of this work has to be done by force account. This work is not contracting, it is expanding by the very nature of the enterprise.

Mr. KIRWAN. If we were to cut out automobiles here in Washington where they can get streetcars or buses I would cast my vote for it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Can the gentleman tell us how many new automobiles were given the Secretary's office?

Mr. KIRWAN. Where?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Here in Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. We did not give them any.

Mr. KIRWAN. The Secretary's office has the biggest job it has ever had in the history of this Government.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Answering the gentleman's question, may I say that the Secretary's office did not get an automobile and did not ask for any.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not think anyone objects to furnishing automobiles for field use where they are necessary. But the objections and the protests have been getting stronger and stronger in recent months due to the fact that every sort of little employee in Washington has a Government automobile which could be transferred for field use. These Government automobiles here in Washington are used to get the groceries, to drive friends to social parties, all contrary to law, but nothing is being done about it.

Mr. KIRWAN. Maybe I will agree with the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thought the gentleman would.

Mr. KIRWAN. But I am arguing about four automobiles out in the field.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I suggest you transfer some of these Government cars that are being used illegally here in Washington out to the field and you will have plenty of automobiles to meet all proper needs there.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I realize it is a rather small thing to be talking about adding four automobiles, but, as the author of the amendment points out, this bill provides not only for 122 additional automobiles to be added to the 5,000 or more which they already have, but further on in the bill—this is speaking a little ahead—I call attention to another feature which to me does not make sense. Section 102, page 36, states that the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the purchase of station wagons without such vehicles being considered as passenger motor vehicles.

How anyone could interpret that a station wagon is not a passenger vehicle, I do not know. The fact of the matter is a station wagon today is one of the most dressed up forms of passenger transportation that we have. You will find Members of Congress driving station wagons in preference to what would ordinarily be termed passenger cars. I imagine that the committee was interpreting that a station wagon was the old form of conveyance that was used as a carry-all, a utility car, and so forth. If they want to do that, I think we could change this wording to "carry-all" or to "panel truck with seats" or use some other wording. But if we are going to permit the Department to add 122 cars and also permit them to buy without any restriction at all any number of station wagons which might be a glorified form of sedan—I think some of them are

called country squire cars—it would be a mistake. The fact of the matter is, any car that is used in Government business should be identified with more than the Government license to avoid this practice of using them as pleasure cars. I have no objection to any department having all the transportation that it needs. Like the gentleman from Mississippi, I do not like to seem picayunish about a small thing such as the four automobiles being involved here, but unless we start in and cut out some of these small things we are not going to be conscious of some of the larger appropriations that we have, and we can make a start by adopting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I know the gentleman wants to be fair. The station wagons are used to haul men with their tools and equipment in the field. This is not any attempt to try to give some bureaucrat, so to speak, a fine station wagon to travel around in. This is to haul workmen and field service parties in the field. The language is in the bill because of a ruling by the Comptroller General. The Comptroller General ruled that station wagons are, in effect, passenger vehicles and they require specific authorization in a bill. That is the reason for it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Does not the gentleman think it would be better to put the words "carry-all" or "panel truck" in there rather than "station wagon," because of the fact that today the station wagon has been dressed up and is a more expensive vehicle than the panel truck or the passenger car?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman may be entirely right. When we get to that point we will see what we can do about it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I hope you will.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I want to make it clear that it is solely for the purpose of hauling the workmen out in the field, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bonneville Power Administration and these other agencies, because they can haul a lot more men in that type of vehicle than any other type of automobile.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. But the carry-all will do the job completely and will not lend itself to being used as a pleasure car.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi) there were—ayes 94, noes 41.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and performance of other functions, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their

resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, \$7,700,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation may be expended on a reimbursable basis for surveys of lands other than those under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PICKETT: On page 6, line 25, strike out "\$7,700,000" and insert "\$6,900,000."

(Mr. PICKETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to reduce the sum allowed by the committee for this item in this bill from \$7,700,000 to \$6,900,000, a total cut of \$800,000.

The purposes for which the money is appropriated in this bill to the Bureau of Land Management are several. One is the lease and disposal of lands and mineral resources, and others are land classification, grazing administration, forest management, cadastral surveys, soil and moisture conservation, Squaw Butte Experimentation Station, fire suppression, and general administration.

Each one of these items is increased in this bill over what the Bureau has been allotted for these items in the current fiscal year. As requests were presented to the Bureau of the Budget, the Department requested a total of \$8,850,000 for the Bureau of Land Management. The committee cut out \$1,000,000 for construction. They just would not allow that at all. That left \$7,850,000. Out of that the committee took \$150,000 for assorted minor items. My amendment, if adopted, would reduce the \$7,700,000 by \$800,000.

What is the situation in regard to the request and the allocation by the committee in this bill as compared to what is available for the current fiscal year? The committee allows \$7,700,000. Available for the current year is \$6,927,810. Therefore, the committee allows an increase for 1952 of \$782,190.

I have long followed the policy that we in this Congress, when we go to authorize or appropriate money, ought to eliminate entirely the unnecessary items, we ought to reduce the desirable items as low as possible, and we ought to scrutinize very carefully indeed those that are essential before we legislate and approve the projects that are submitted.

Let it be said, and it no doubt will be said, that some of the functions of this Bureau of Land Management are self-sustaining, that they have some connection with the national defense, and I am not going to quarrel about that to any great extent, although I think it is indirect rather than direct; but lest it be said the Bureau could not sustain that kind of a cut and carry on its operations, let us look at two items in the bill we have here.

The committee bill includes \$555,000 for land classification. This means the classification of public domain lands to determine whether they are most suitable for agriculture, grazing, forestry, or some other purpose.

Also included in this item is \$765,000 for cadastral surveys. That is a survey of public-domain lands to establish township, section, and other legal land boundaries.

I contend that the total of \$1,320,000 for those two items would fall in the unnecessary or unessential category; but let us say it does not go that far and that, therefore, we do not cut it all out. Let us say it falls in the desirable classification. Therefore, it falls within the category of items we can legitimately cut from this bill, and save a reasonable sum of money. By cutting here we can do a little something toward economy in these appropriations and in this Government, and afford some modicum of relief, possibly, to the taxpayers, who are being called on to carry an ever-heavier burden from time to time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. If I understand the gist of the gentleman's argument, it is simply this, that since we now owe \$260,000,000,000 and since we are going to be called upon to pay heavier taxes and even with the new tax bill it is estimated that we will be \$10,000,000,000 in the red for this year, the gentleman thinks that under these conditions, as worth while as some of this work may be, it might be postponed to another day.

Mr. PICKETT. I certainly do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak for an additional 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Has the gentleman noticed that the committee saw fit to appropriate for soil and moisture conservation some \$304,150 above the 1951 amount which was allotted for that purpose?

Mr. PICKETT. I had noticed that.

Mr. JENSEN. We are spending the large sum of a cent or a cent and a half an acre for soil and moisture conservation on all our public lands. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that more money should be spent for soil and moisture conservation on public lands because of the very fact that we need all kinds of vegetation on these lands in order to keep the soil where it belongs and keep it from running down into the streams and being piled up behind the dams that we are building and spending hundreds of millions of dollars on. I hope the gentleman will amend his amendment and exclude soil and moisture conservation. Will you do that?

Mr. PICKETT. Let me say to the gentleman from Iowa I am not ever going to quarrel with him about the essentialities of providing for necessary conservation of the natural resources of this country. But I do say that you have an item here of \$7,700,000 which, according to the facts and figures available, is 10 percent

more than what they have in the current fiscal year. This amendment is not a selective one reducing any particular function of the several which the Bureau performs. I say that you can reduce all of it a little bit, if nothing else, by reduction of personnel, a better use of personnel, and a reorganization of the Bureau or by any other method that you want to. I am willing to leave it to the Bureau. But I point out here in this discussion that there are two things which are absolutely unessential and unnecessary under the stress and strain of present conditions, and they are land classification and cadastral surveys. If you took \$1,320,000 allotted to those two items out of this bill you would not be injuring an essential function of the Government. But you certainly could take the whole 800,000 which I propose to cut by my amendment out of the two items which I have referred to, and you will not be doing any injury to any essential function of the Government.

Let the Department be selective about it and choose how they shall effect economies.

Mr. JENSEN. I would like to hear the gentleman say that he hopes, if his amendment is adopted, that no part of the savings will be taken out of the soil and moisture conservation item. Will the gentleman say that?

Mr. PICKETT. I will go this far with the gentleman, and say that I hope none of this money, if the amendment is adopted, will be taken out of the soil and moisture conservation item unless they find in that item that they are wasting some of the money which is being given to them. If they find that, and they might find it, they ought to cut out the waste.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, in that connection the proposal to give a more than 10-percent increase in this bill, as compared to what it was for the current year, provides for an increase of 98 employees. But they say that most of them will go to the grazing service. That is true, but it is 98 employees over what they now have. It would provide for an increase of 148 more employees than they had for the fiscal year 1950. That illustrates where your Government is growing—item by item, individual by individual, and year by year. If you do not put a stop to it somewhere you are going to have it so big that everybody will be on the Government payroll.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, last year this item in the bill was for \$6,927,810. This year it is \$7,700,000. Why the increase? The grazing fees were raised 30 percent and

this brings in \$572,000 alone. That much money comes back into the Treasury of the United States. After the grazing fees were raised it was only fair that the men who raised the cattle were entitled to more consideration. Are the people who pay these additional funds not entitled to protection? If they are, then more employees must be hired.

I want to throw this challenge out to the West. It was my privilege to be invited to a luncheon on the Senate side earlier this year. I think there were three other Members of the House invited the purpose was to discuss the noxious weed. It was pointed out that this plant came over here from Russia and that it would cost \$1,000,000,000 to kill it. It is at the present time sweeping over this country like prairie fire. One cattleman alone lost 1200 sheep on one range. All we are spending is \$7,000,000, when they said it would take a billion dollars to make a dent in combatting this weed. Here we are asking for only \$7,000,000. It has now reached as far east as Nebraska. It is showing up all over the country, and huge numbers of cattle and sheep have been destroyed by this weed. What have we got to stop it in this the greatest country in the world? Seven million dollars. There are 180,000,000 acres of your own land, land owned by you, and all we are spending on that acreage is one-half cent per acre for soil conservation. There is no nation in the world that would not spend 10 times that amount to prevent starvation and famine on their own land.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. With reference to the cadastral surveys mentioned by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT], I just happen to know a little about the problem which this appropriation refers to. The O. and C. Administration in the Bureau of Land Management has to manage three and one-half million acres of timberland in the State of Oregon. It is necessary, in order to make a sale of timber and to manage an area properly, to have the land surveyed. A specific problem came up last fall. A buyer of timber came to me and said he was not able to complete a deal on the necessary timber to keep his operation running because he could not get it surveyed. I took the problem up with the O. and C. Administration and was informed that they had enough requests on file then to keep their existing survey personnel busy 80 years. They thought that about 80 years after that date they might be able to go ahead and survey the land. I cannot go into the merits of the gentleman's amendment whether or not this cut can be made. All I can say in answer to his statement in regard to these cadastral surveys is that if we are going to manage this timberland acreage properly we must have the surveys.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. In that same connection the gentleman's amendment will have the effect of cut-

ting the funds for fire suppression, involving the greatest stand of timber in the country in Oregon. It does not affect the State of Washington, but the State of Oregon has a great deal at stake, in preserving this valuable stand of timber.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman. As I said, it is only \$1,000,000 more than we allowed last year, and \$500,000 of that goes for the enforcement of this Grazing Act. We had scientists from the West before our committee, and they stated it would take a billion dollars to kill the noxious weed now sweeping the country like a prairie fire. All we allowed was \$500,000 to take care of it. If you choose to let it go, it is O. K. with me. The decision and the responsibility is yours.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this morning the full Committee on Appropriations reported a bill calling for additional military expenditures during the fiscal year 1951 to the huge sum of \$6,400,000,000. I think in view of the absolute necessity that faces us of finding that amount of money for the military, certainly we must do everything we possibly can toward saving here and there in things which can well be put off for a few years without any bad effects upon our country.

I think the gentleman from Texas is absolutely correct when he says that such items as land classification and also cadastral survey can be slowed up on now without harm. That is the kind of work that should be done in the future when plenty of manpower is available instead of taking our personnel away from the war effort.

I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be adopted. Certainly it will be if we keep in mind the serious necessity of trying to find such an enormous sum as \$6,400,000,000 for national defense which was just reported out by my committee this morning.

Worthy as many projects may be, it is our duty to evaluate the respective values. In this amendment there is no curtailment of activities affecting the lives and welfare of human beings. This sort of work should be put off to such time in the future when the need for all-out preparedness is not so necessary. Nondefense items must be thrown out of this budget.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN to the amendment offered by Mr. PICKETT: "Provided, That this amendment shall not apply to soil and moisture conservation."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I will accept the amendment.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat responsible, or I hope I am, for increasing the items in this bill as it affects the Department of Land Management. I have pleaded with the Bureau of Land Management and also with the Bureau of the Budget that this is one agency

of the Government that has never had adequate appropriations.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I agree with the gentleman in his compliments of the Bureau of Land Management, although I intend to support this amendment. I should like to say with all due respect to the Bureau of Land Management that the subcommittee of which I was chairman last year, whose duty it was to investigate overstaffing in the Government service, had nothing but compliments for the Bureau of Land Management for the efficient manner with which they managed their personnel problems.

Mr. GRANGER. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that, for that is exactly what I wanted to talk about.

The reason I feel somewhat responsible for the amendment is the fact that for the last 2 or 3 years there has always been this controversy between the users of the public domain and the committee as to the grazing fees. I was somewhat instrumental in having the grazing fees raised; and as a result of that \$500,000 has been brought into the Treasury. It would seem to me to be most unfair at this time after the Bureau itself and the users of the public domain had been willing to accept the Committee's recommendation. Now we turn around and say that because they have been willing to cooperate we are now going to cut this item in the budget.

Further than that, every item referred to by the gentleman from Texas is tremendously important, more important now due to the war effort. I have had hundreds of letters from veterans who are trying to get homesteads. Many of these lands are not even surveyed and cannot be classified. It cannot be determined whether or not they are useful for that purpose until a survey is made. I have taken an interest in that item. I have tried to get adequate personnel so that we might have the land surveyed and classified.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I believe the gentleman will agree that whatever fund the Bureau of Land Management does have should be allocated to the things that the gentleman has been mentioning, like surveys, where they are vitally needed and where they will do the most good. If we are going to reduce appropriations the remaining funds should be applied in the most skillful and advantageous way possible.

Mr. GRANGER. Yes. I agree with the gentleman and that is the thing which is wrong with this amendment. It makes an over-all cut of \$800,000, then it is left to the Bureau to determine where the cut is to be made. That has never proven to be a satisfactory way of reducing an expenditure to the Government; that is, allow the department to allocate it where it thinks it is needed. I assure you there would likely not be any reduction in the ad-

ministration of the act. It would come from services performed.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKETT. As I tried to indicate in my discussion of the amendment, the entire amount could come out of the \$1,320,000 allocated for land surveys and cadastral surveys. Someone objects to that and says: "We cannot cut that." Someone objects to a reduction of anything when you try to cut theirs. It could come out of those two items and do no injury to any other part of the program.

Mr. GRANGER. I have worked closely with the gentleman in connection with these things, in fire prevention and other worthy purposes, and he is an advocate of spending money for those purposes. Now he is offering an amendment that is absolutely contrary to what he has ever done before.

Mr. PICKETT. If the gentleman will yield, I respectfully disagree with him. The gentleman does not have the time and I shall not take the time to debate that, but the gentleman's statement is not entirely accurate.

Mr. GRANGER. I want it to be accurate. I will see the gentleman and we will make it accurate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment I have offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN to the amendment offered by Mr. PICKETT: Insert "of which \$1,200,000 shall be used for soil and moisture conservation."

Mr. KIRWAN. We will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and 10 of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C. 315), sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received, during the current fiscal year, as range improvement fees under section 3 of said act and of 25 percent of all moneys received, during the current fiscal year, under section 15 of said act, to remain available until expended.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss an action taken by the subcommittee which

seems to me was inadvisable. During the debate on this bill and other appropriation bills we have repeatedly stricken out, by points of order, legislation on appropriation bills. The committee action I speak of now is not legislation in this appropriation bill. It is an indirect bit of legislation. I refer to the statement of the committee on page 5 of the report wherein it discusses the elimination of the item of \$1,000,000 for construction in the Bureau of Land Management budget, the construction being for the building of access roads in the O & C area, most of which land lies in the State of Oregon. What the committee says in that paragraph is this:

While not denying the merit of such roads, the committee has rejected this estimate. The committee was willing to provide funds for the initiation of an access road program in prior years on the assumption that the legislation relating to the distribution of receipts from the sale of timber would be modified.

Later on in the same paragraph it says:

The committee will be unwilling to provide for capital expenditures of this nature unless and until substantial adjustments are made regarding the distribution of receipts of timber sales from the O. & C. and Coos Bay grant lands.

That would seem to me a method used by the Committee on Appropriations to compel legislative action which must come through the Committee on Public Lands. The Committee on Public Lands has had this matter under consideration for years. I was a Member of that committee for one term of Congress and I know we discussed it then. We have been trying to work out the matter of distribution of payments to the counties involved in these land grants, but for the Committee on Appropriations to come in and at this point stop the road construction program which is necessary for the removal and the harvesting of timber needed in our present mobilization effort, to eliminate that appropriation at this time merely because it does not like the existing law, with reference to the O. & C. grant, I think is not only unfair, but I think it is unwise. I think it is a mistake to get at a problem of that kind in such an indirect way. This is said without reference to how much should be included for an appropriation. I just object to this method of doing it.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. Would the gentleman kindly tell the House how much money from the sale of the timber owned by the United States Government, the property of the taxpayers, goes into the Treasury of the United States, and how much goes out as a gift or donation?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I will try and give the gentleman the figures that he indicates. Since 1938 down to 1950 the average payment to the counties has been \$916,000 a year. May I point out to the gentleman that this land is now conservatively valued in the neighborhood of \$500,000,000. If it were on the tax rolls I think we would be collecting in the

same area rather more than \$1,000,000 per year in taxes, so I do not think the present situation is too out of line.

Mr. NORRELL. The truth is though, is it not, that although this timber is owned by the Government, little, if any of the money derived from the sale goes into the Treasury of the United States, and not only do we donate the entire purchase of the timber but the Government has heretofore been constructing access roads to get it out of there, and we ought not to construct roads at enormous expense in order to give the money away to somebody else.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I must correct the gentleman. He is almost totally wrong in that statement. The land originally was on the tax rolls of the State of Oregon. It was repossessed by the United States Government in 1916. The Government at that time paid out a total of \$5,673,000 for the land. The gentleman stated that the Government was not receiving any money. That is not true. The Government has received to date \$8,105,000 from the land, which should never actually have been back in the hands of the United States Government at all. It should have been on the tax rolls of the counties of the State of Oregon.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. First let me say to the gentleman that the committee certainly did not engage in legislating on this item.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I think it actually had that effect, if I may say so.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. If I may finish my statement, the statement in the committee report merely gives the reason why the funds were denied.

The committee wanted to be fair about this and tried to do the right thing. If the House is interested in economy I think it should be advised of the record in the hearings in connection with the disposition of funds from the sale of the Federal timber in this area.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The committee did an excellent job in the hearings and in the complete statement of the subject that is contained in the volume of the hearings on this bill. I think it is a very constructive piece of work.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. We tried to get the facts. The House should be advised that we are in the situation where practically all of the proceeds from the sale of the timber go to the State of Oregon. Uncle Sam has the job of administering this great resource but gets hardly anything out of it.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I must correct the gentleman on that, because the very book he is reading from does not bear it out.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That statement stands, and the record bears it out.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. No, it cannot bear it out, because by law at the present time the counties in the State of Oregon cannot receive more than 50 percent. Then there is a 25 percent that goes into the repayment of a debt previously con-

tracted in lieu of taxes to the State. The Federal Government receives 25 percent. Nothing can change that.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Then there is another 25 percent, which brings it up to 100 percent, for administration.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The gentleman clearly does not understand this matter. The facts are as I have just given them.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. We want to be fair and get all the facts. The committee went to great lengths to make a complete study.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. You have the facts correct in the hearings statement, I will say that.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. If the gentleman will refer to page 208 of part 1 of the hearings, he will see that I asked Mr. Clawson, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, some questions in connection with this matter. At one point in the middle of that page I said, "It has been about 15 or 16 percent of the amount, not 25 percent?"

That is referring, I believe, to the administrative expense.

Mr. CLAWSON. That is correct—I do not know the exact figure.

Mr. JACKSON. That is what we have been appropriating?

Mr. CLAWSON. That is what was appropriated I believe last year.

Mr. JACKSON. When you sell \$1,000,000 worth of timber, \$910,000 goes to the counties and \$90,000 to the Federal Government?

Mr. CLAWSON. No; \$750,000 will go to the counties, and whatever you appropriate—

Mr. JACKSON. I mean, the Government gets net how much?

Mr. CLAWSON. The net to the Government will be very low.

Mr. JACKSON. It will run about 9 percent?

Mr. CLAWSON. Yes.

We are gradually approaching a point where the State of Oregon will get the entire proceeds of the sale.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. No. Let me correct the gentleman once more. The colloquy with Mr. Clawson is a statement that is technically accurate, but the law provides that 25 percent goes to the Federal Government, then you appropriate the administrative costs. You do that with the Forest Service and you do it with the Grazing Service.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I know, but the Government gets net practically nothing out of this. At the present time it is around 9 percent. As administrative costs go up and it reaches the full 25 percent, the Government will not get a dime out of it. We do not have that in connection with the Forest Service timber. It is a very unfair situation.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Consider this, if the gentleman from Washington will, this land which we are now discussing represents 30 miles on each side of the Southern Pacific Railroad from the California State line to the Washington State line. It is some of the best and most valuable land in the State of Oregon.

The State of Oregon presently is 52 percent owned by the Government of the United States. It has been clearly revealed in the hearings time and time again that the State of Oregon, with this land taken right out of the heart of it, certainly is entitled to reimburse-

ment from the proceeds from that land. That is the situation.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Of course I think the gentleman is aware of the fact that the timber or the land which was revested from the railroads, the title reverting to the Federal Government under the provisions of the law, has been more beneficial to the State of Oregon under this arrangement than it would have been had the railroad continued to own it because all of their back taxes have been paid.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Of course, as the gentleman knows, had the railroad continued to own the land and had it gone into private hands it would undoubtedly have been developed and been taxed and we would be receiving a million dollars a year or more in taxes instead of \$900,000. And the situation in the State of Oregon would be infinitely better regardless of the statement that the Government does not get anything out of it. The situation in Oregon would be better if these lands had never been revested in the Government of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. May I say to the gentleman from Oregon I certainly want to be fair about this, too. I am trying to be absolutely impartial. Looking at the record it is quite obvious that the existing basic law must be corrected.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I agree on that point.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman agrees on that point.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I agree that with the coming into being of the final 25 percent payment which has not yet been made, the counties are now receiving only 50 percent, I feel certain there should be a modification. I find no objection to the gentleman's point of view that there should be legislation on this matter. Bills for this purpose will be introduced during this session.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is the point—how can the committee, acting in the interest of the entire country, appropriate money for the management of resources where all of the proceeds will be going to the State of Oregon and nothing to Uncle Sam? I just cannot follow that logic.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I have to remind the gentleman, who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, that it is only the Committee on Appropriations' function to determine whether or not the funds requested for the program involved should be allowed. I do not think the Committee on Appropriations has any right in the world to set up this threat and shake their fist at the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Do you mean that the Committee on Appropriations cannot deny funds and give the reasons for it?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Oh, yes, you can. I am saying that you have. There is no question about that.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. We are being fair. We simply gave the reason why the funds were denied. The committee has authority to exercise its discretion in these matters.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. May I point out to the gentleman from Washington that he and every other Member of the House has the right to present to the Committee on Public Lands legislation on this subject and hearings will be held. I, myself, have been endeavoring to work out such a bill for the last 2 years.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think the answer of the committee would be to bring about some legislation.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I would like to make one more point with reference to the values involved here. Every section of this land under discussion is surrounded on all four sides by privately-owned land. The grant is in a checkerboard. The counties of the State of Oregon have to furnish all of the necessary civil administration for this property. The counties are certainly entitled to funds received from the sale of timber. I will say finally to the gentleman from Washington that legislation will be prepared and introduced, but I still do not like this method of shaking the fist at the Committee on Public Lands and the State of Oregon and saying, "You have to do something." It is going to be done. There is no question about that, but the problem is not a simple one. Some little time will be required to perfect the necessary legislation. Meanwhile the access road program which the committee has thus killed should, in the national interest, be continued. In fact the report of the committee agrees to that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, while these gentlemen from the Northwest seem to be arguing about how we should spend dollars and how we could best conserve our natural resources, it occurred to me that perhaps we should give some thought to how we could conserve our manpower, the youth of our land, the fathers of future generations. They are of more importance than either our dollars or our materials. But a Truman tells them to fight; then an Acheson adopts a policy under which some die without a chance to strike back.

In the State of Michigan we have laws which define murder, manslaughter, negligent homicide, and other killings where people's lives are taken.

I was wondering if there is any moral or Federal law that would punish those who, in positions of authority, cause other people to die. For example, in Michigan, if I start at the top of a steep hill and I know there is traffic down at the bottom of that hill and I do not have a proper brake on my car and recklessly

or thoughtlessly I go down that hill, the car, because of improper braking equipment, goes out of control and kills somebody, I am guilty of negligent homicide, if not of something worse.

On the 26th day of June, last, the President ordered our men in Korea to oppose the aggressors. The Congress later said that the Chinese were also aggressors, and that our men must fight the Chinese. I get from the papers that MacArthur and the men who were fighting under him undertook that job and they were doing the very best they could to oppose the North Koreans and the Communists who were coming down through China, and to carry out Mr. Truman's orders. They fought; some 10,000 died. More than 10,000 are missing. Other thousands are casualties and the end is not yet.

Engaged in that job which had been given him by the President, MacArthur suggested that it might be well if we used some of those bombers and fighter planes for which the Congress has appropriated so many millions and billions of dollars, some of which were available over there. Planes which had they been used would have minimized our losses. But Britain through its mouthpiece Acheson said "No," and our men continued to die.

If I understand it correctly, what MacArthur wanted to do was what every military man who was ever charged with winning a war would insist upon doing—using the forces at his command in a manner which would be most destructive to the enemy. But again pro-British Acheson said "No." Men continued to die.

General MacArthur wanted to send our bombers and fighters across the line, perhaps over into Manchuria, destroy some of the enemy's bases, munition dumps, air fields, and communication lines. But again Britain, thinking of her trade dollars, through her spokesman said "No." Men, American men, died. Memory tells me that in World War II in Germany one of the contributing factors, perhaps the most important, to the winning of the war was the destruction of the submarine bases and the air fields back of the German lines by our Air Force, the support given our foot soldiers by the bombing and destruction of Hitler's crack Panzer divisions, the blasting of the enemy's communication lines.

Now, what is the use? Is there any sense in ordering a general to use his troops to win a battle and then taking from him perhaps one of the most effective weapons at his command?

Because to protect his men, aid in winning a war, General MacArthur's suggestion was counter to the wishes of a power-mad British-loving Acheson. MacArthur was fired. Americans fighting in a Truman war are dying.

Beyond question, men died, other men will continue to die because as many say the general's hands were tied. Because he was refused permission to use back of a certain line the forces at his command.

There would be just as much sense in a man trying to win a prize fight under a rule which permitted him to go up to a certain line and sock the other fellow,

knock him dizzy, and which then required him to step back and wait until the opponent had recovered.

To me that does not make sense. Nor does the Acheson-Truman policy.

If we had a Federal law like we have in Michigan, which punishes a man who recklessly causes another's death, this man Acheson, who seems to be running the war, could escape conviction if brought to trial on the charge he had by his conduct needlessly caused the death of our men who fought under MacArthur, who are fighting under Ridgway. Now I do not charge that Acheson is a Communist; I know of no evidence that he is a Communist. But I do say this, that the things that man has done and is doing, the policies he has advocated, and now advises not only have been pro-British, but the record will show, have aided the Communists. Why keep him and fire MacArthur? Acheson's policies have favored the Communists; MacArthur has fought them. Why keep Acheson?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If I may have one more minute. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Is there any way under the rules that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] can explain to the gallery and the high-school classes now in the gallery how he can change the procedure so suddenly? I am afraid it is confusing to our visitors.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am not changing the procedure. Students in the gallery. My remarks are addressed to the House, not to those in the gallery. The gentleman knows I cannot talk to the gallery. I do not need to do that; I can get my information to them by news letters and press releases, and I do not have to frank them out either. The situation may give amusement to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY]. To me the youth of our land are more important than our dollars. We wasted our dollars on the Marshall plan. Now we waste the blood of our young men on the Acheson-Marshall international plan.

I will say to the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle or anybody who cares to listen that while we have been talking about the conservation of natural resources I am talking about the conservation of the youth of the land who today are dying in a war which they are prohibited by the orders of the President—and I do not blame him because I think he is under the thumb of this man Acheson—they are prevented from winning that war in the shortest possible time with the least loss of life by the policy of an Acheson—and more about him tomorrow.

I hope that somebody on the majority side will tell me and those who are interested in our people's welfare and the security of the Republic just what it is—and I have asked this before—just what

it is that the soldiers in Korea must do, which having done, the war has been won, peace has been established, and they can come home. Now, tell the people who are paying for and fighting this war. Neither Acheson, the President, nor anybody else has ever answered that question. But the war goes on and day and night our men are dying in Korea. Why not tell them what it is all about?

And why is a great, patriotic general fired while a British-loving Communist-serving Secretary of State speaking for America directing a war.

Fire Acheson, the American people are demanding.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resources management: For expenses necessary for management, development, improvement, and protection of resources and appurtenant facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including payment of irrigation assessments and charges; acquisition of water rights; conducting agricultural experiments and demonstrations; furnishing plants or seed to Indians; advances for Indian industrial and business enterprises; payment of expenses of Indian fairs, including premiums for exhibits; and development of Indian arts and crafts as authorized by law (25 U. S. C. 305), including expenses of exhibits; \$11,400,000.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], chairman of the committee, a few questions. I wish to inquire about the appropriation for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I notice that the appropriation is in one lump sum, broken down into a few major items. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is correct, yes.

Mr. SCHWABE. And no attempt was made in the bill or in the report to divide the sum to show what individual projects were included such as individual schools, individual reservations, individual hospitals, and the like. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is correct.

Mr. SCHWABE. May I ask why the change was made to the lump-sum method in this bill rather than tying it down to the individual projects?

Mr. KIRWAN. I think it was the best judgment of the committee that we should let the man in charge of the individual bureau run Indian affairs as he saw fit. The committee was satisfied that whereas when we send millions of dollars to Europe and other places we do not tell them that they must use this money for this, that, and the other specific thing; that likewise in the matter of the Indian Bureau we should let the head of that agency use a little Americanism, use his own personal judgment, as to where he spends the money. He knows something about the needs of the Indians.

Mr. SCHWABE. May I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to whom the chairman has just referred, has been Commissioner of Indian Affairs only since May of 1950? That is the total length of time he has been identified with the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. KIRWAN. But he has 5,000 people working under him—

Mr. SCHWABE. My statement is correct, is it not?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is correct; but he has 5,000 people working under him who have been there for years. So they know something about what it is all about. Take a child out of the second or third grade in school and put him out on an Indian reservation and let him take one look at what we have done to them. We cannot do much more to them than what we have done through the past 75 years.

Mr. SCHWABE. Or more.

Mr. KIRWAN. Or more; yes.

Mr. SCHWABE. As a matter of fact, he has, according to the hearings as shown at page 245, a total of 13,127 employees in the Bureau of Indian Affairs. And may I ask the gentleman now if whether in an investigation made under this very bill whether or not other district offices such, for instance, as I have reference to as the district office that was formerly established and in operation for a while at Oklahoma City, Okla., which was the object of criticism and objected to by every member of the Oklahoma delegation in both Houses of the Congress, will be reestablished under the provisions of this bill? Or can the chairman tell me?

Mr. KIRWAN. I would not know until I saw the workings next year whether they will or will not.

Mr. SCHWABE. Is it not a fact that information has already gone out that this super-duper office will likely be reestablished again? In that connection I have here a letter from a prominent attorney at Miami, Okla., who, by the way, is a Democrat, and from others, Democrats and Republicans. We try to look at this thing down there from the standpoint of the Indians and what is best for them. We found that the district office which was abolished in the Eightieth Congress at the request of all of the Members of Congress from Oklahoma was a reprimand to the service rather than a benefit. The letter to which I have referred says:

We have noticed recent press releases to the effect that the Government contemplates establishing one large central Indian agency at Oklahoma City. It is our understanding that this agency will serve the entire State of Oklahoma and the present existing agencies would be abolished.

Mr. Chairman, we found out, I think conclusively, in our hearings, in which the gentleman participated, that the greatest service that could be rendered the Indians was at the lower level, the service level, not here in Washington, nor in a super-duper district office, as they call them, sometimes known as regional offices. We are afraid that it may be reestablished there and I wanted to ask the chairman of the committee if the committee considered that at all or could give us any light on the subject.

Mr. KIRWAN. I would not know whether they will be able to do what the gentleman is talking about or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. It is about 80 years now since this superior race, that is what we call ourselves, the white race of America, took this country away from the original owners and stuck them out on reservations as they are called, mostly out on stone and rock, where there was no water. We said to them: "If you go there peacefully without any quarrel," and they entered into 400 contracts and agreements with the Indians, "we will provide a school for every 35 children and a school teacher." Eighty-five years after that we have 17,000 out of 23,000 Navajo Indians who have never put their foot in school. We have them out on a desert where there is nothing but sand. We do not provide water for them or any way to get water to them. Instead of being called Indians they should be called camels because they can go 8 days without water.

There is no hospital on the Papago Indian Reservation. There is a stretch of 90 miles out there without a hospital. There is not a Member of this House who would not jump up in horror if some concentration camp over in Europe did not have a doctor a half a dozen nurses within a very small enclosure.

You are not going to do much for them in this bill. You will appropriate to put on 500 people so the Indians will have somebody to complain to, but as for doing anything for them, you, I nor any Member of this House will not do a thing because we have not done a thing for them in 85 years and I know we are not going to start now.

Mr. SCHWABE. May I suggest that I agree with the gentlemen as to his general remarks and I am sure we are all in sympathy with those remarks. We should have done more than we have. His remarks exactly agree with my views that it is a shame and a disgrace the way the Bureau of Indian Affairs has handled this situation with the tolerance of Congress. That is borne out by the report of this subcommittee, and I read from page 8 of the report on the bill now being considered:

A report by the committee's investigative staff indicated that there are deficiencies both in the organizational structure of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and with respect to certain undesirable practices which apparently have not been adequately controlled. The Commissioner has indicated his desire to utilize the information developed in the investigative report and to take necessary corrective action. The committee urges him to do so, thoroughly and promptly.

Then let me quote a statement or two from the report on Indian hospitals to which the chairman has just referred.

From the investigative staff report on page 243 of the hearings I quote this language, which was read in the hearings by the gentleman from Iowa, Congressman JENSEN:

It was found that Indian hospitals are being located in some areas where there are

adequate State or local facilities available. For instance, an Indian hospital is maintained near Yuma, Ariz. The average daily cost per patient exceeds \$24 per day. Staff inquiry revealed that adequate hospital facilities are available in a local hospital only 6 miles distant from the Indian hospital and that the per patient day cost is approximately \$14. Discussions with officials of this hospital revealed that BIA representatives have never discussed with them the possibility of perfecting arrangements for the treatment of Indian patients.

Then on page 44, reading from the committee's own investigative staff report:

The Bureau should delegate to the area level adequate authority to efficiently administer all phases of personnel management.

Then it goes on to say:

Complete revision of accounting procedures both at Washington headquarters and in the field is urgently needed.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, where did the gentleman say that hospital was located? Mr. SCHWABE. Yuma, Ariz.

Mr. KIRWAN. Why did not the gentleman that turned in that report turn it in to the Kefauver committee? That is a racket.

Mr. SCHWABE. They turned it in to the gentleman's committee.

Mr. KIRWAN. Oh, no. The gentleman asked for an investigation. But, I am not saying that I believe what that man said. If it is the truth, it does not belong to us; it belongs before the Kefauver committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Chairman, assembled here at this time in the consideration of this bill there are instances after instances that may be read from this committee report which was gotten out by the investigative staff of this subcommittee; an investigative staff that I never saw or have anything to do with. I did not know anything about the report until I found it here.

For instance, on page 248 of the printed hearings there is an excerpt which reads:

The area office—

That is one of these superduper offices, I think—

is staffed with an attorney-adviser. The area director admits he has no need for an attorney. The offices of the United States district attorney are adjacent to the BIA offices, and he can and does use this office when legal assistance is necessary.

Then the report goes on and on, and then they speak of the Navajos on page 249 where there appears this line from the staff investigative force of this Interior Subcommittee:

On the Navajo there are eight schools which are not being used at present.

Then on page 250 there is an excerpt from the report which reads as follows:

The total cost will be approximately \$6,000,000, or about \$8,500 per pupil.

That relates to the Shiprock School.

The buildings which have been completed were visited and the criticism voiced by several people that they are extravagant beyond all necessity appears fully warranted—

And so on. Mr. Chairman, the whole story is simply this:

The Bureau of Indian Affairs has been a stench in the nostrils of this Government for many years. That is the reason, as the chairman points out, why the Indians have not had the service to which they were entitled and for which we have appropriated so lavishly.

There are two or three tribes, including the Osage Tribe of Oklahoma and the Klamath Tribe of Oregon, whose funds are appropriated for the operation of their own agencies and activities. Is that correct?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes.

Mr. SCHWABE. There is nothing in this report or this bill to indicate how much was appropriated out of their own funds?

Mr. KIRWAN. No.

I wish the gentleman would answer this question.

Mr. SCHWABE. I will try to.

Mr. KIRWAN. Will the gentleman try to have somebody on that side offer an amendment providing \$100,000,000 to be spent on the real American, the only American, that we now have stuck out on the desert, if we want to prove that we were worthy to come into this country?

I have said this before but one time when the Indian question was up and it was being said that they should have done this or should have done that, a former Representative from Oklahoma, Mr. Carter, a full-blooded Indian, said, "Yes, I said we made mistakes, but the greatest mistake we made was when we let a white man put a foot in this country." So if you on that side want to do something, offer an amendment to provide \$100,000,000, and even that will only be making a dent in what should be done.

Mr. SCHWABE. It might be done, and perhaps unanimously, if the Members of this Congress, including myself, and I think the chairman, had confidence in the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The present Commissioner of Indian Affairs apparently did not know anything about any of the things he was questioned on which were expressed in the committee's report of its investigative staff.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want the Record to show at this point that the committee had an itemized breakdown of the budget estimates for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. It was broken down into dollars and cents, into small items. Except as shown in the report otherwise, the committee has allowed the budget items. The reduction we made is to be applied optionally by the Indian Service.

But I do not want the Record to indicate that we have allowed \$65,000,000 to be expended as the Indian Service may desire. That is not the case. That is not what my chairman has said, and it is not what the committee has done. We have allowed the budget estimates except as otherwise shown in the report. We cut the budget estimates from \$71,425,000 to an even \$65,000,000. We are permitting the Indian Service to apply those cuts where they may see proper. That is exactly what we are doing, if you adopt the recommendations of the committee.

I want to say this on behalf of the United States Government. I think we have endeavored to do a good job by the Indians since we have been trying to rehabilitate them. The taxpayers of the United States ought to have some credit for the millions and millions they have contributed to the Indians throughout this country. At least we have expended large sums of money and I believe the Indians appreciate it.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Does this language contain authority for the reestablishment of a district office at Oklahoma City?

Mr. NORRELL. As I recall, that was discussed in the subcommittee. I am under the impression that the Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs expects to try to work that out to the satisfaction of the congressional delegation of Oklahoma, if that is possible.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman brought out a point I think the House should know, that the subcommittee did reduce the Budget estimates by more than \$6,000,000. Nevertheless, the bureau of Indian Affairs has a right, if it sees fit, to take every dime of that \$6,000,000 out of the item of health, education, and welfare. I do not think the gentleman can dispute that statement. Am I correct? Will the gentleman answer that?

Mr. NORRELL. I will answer the question if the gentleman will let me.

The only thing that is optional with the Indian Service is to take what we cut them, to take the amount that we reduce their budget estimates, and apply that where they think it is best to apply it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Just a minute.

Mr. NORRELL. I am answering the gentleman's question now.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Please be specific. They may take every dime of the proposed cut out of the one item.

Mr. NORRELL. If I am going to answer the gentleman, I hope the gentleman will permit me to answer, otherwise I must decline to yield. I will answer the gentleman's question if he wants me to. The thing that they can do is to take the money that we cut them and

apply it where they think it can best be applied. The committee thought the Indian Service was more capable of directing where those cuts should be made than the subcommittee was.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to my friend from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I merely wanted to make a brief observation in connection with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The new Commissioner, Mr. Dillon Myer, in my opinion is trying to do an honest and efficient job in straightening out many of the difficulties within the Bureau. I believe he is trying to get people in who will be willing to do a real job to emancipate many of the Indians who should be emancipated. We are spending a great deal of money, in my opinion, in certain areas where we do not need to spend the money because we are still trying to tell them what business to engage in; how to manage their own business affairs; and so forth, when they are perfectly capable of doing the job themselves. That sort of thing must come to an end if we are going to make first-class American citizens out of them and not second-class American citizens.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman from Washington answer the question to which the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] did not see fit to make an exact answer? You will please notice that I am only asking a question, and not criticizing the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Is it not possible under the bill for the Bureau of Indian Affairs to take every dime of the proposed saving of \$6,000,000 out of the one item of health, education, and welfare services if they so see fit?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. First let me say I am sure my good friend, the gentleman from Arkansas, answered the question; but to repeat, I will say that under the authority given by the committee and the way the cut was made, they can apply it in any way they see fit. So that they can take it all out of health, or all out of construction.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. They can take it all out of health and welfare if they so see fit.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I would like to continue my answer.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am sorry but I cannot yield further.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. May I just answer?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. No. I regret that my time is limited and that I cannot yield further.

Mr. Chairman, that is the point I am fearful of here. I have an Indian boarding school in my congressional district which takes care of about 200 Indian children from broken homes. Those children have no place in the world to go today if that particular school at Pipestone, Minn., is closed down. I certainly am not encouraged by the attitude of the Indian Bureau, which seemingly cannot see the great necessity, not only of retaining Pipestone Indian School, but

also of enlarging it into a vocational school. Thus these children could learn a trade and after graduation from high school would be able to find a good job for which they were qualified. I surely do not object to the cut of \$6,000,000. I approve of it. But I cannot see the advisability of giving to any bureau the right to determine where this cut of \$6,000,000 should be applied. That is our responsibility. It is up to us to see that each division of the Indian Bureau receives a certain amount. We should not give anyone a blank check.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas. He is always good about yielding to others.

Mr. NORRELL. I know that the gentleman is sincere, and I do not mean to be insincere, but does the gentleman believe for one moment that the Indian Service under the charge and management and direction of Dillon Myer is going to place all these cuts on the sick and blind and the aged and the others that the gentleman has mentioned? Do you believe that he would do that?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I hope not.

I will say to the gentleman that the work of the Indian school at Pipestone has meant so much to the children who came there from broken homes, that I sincerely hope that Mr. Myer will see fit to enlarge the scope of that school. I am sure that he will not make such items as education and welfare assume more than a small portion of the \$6,000,000 reduction. We are dealing here with human beings.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will he gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. I think the gentleman should at least be consistent over a period of an hour. The gentleman just supported an amendment a few minutes ago that did exactly what he is complaining about.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Oh, I think the gentleman from Minnesota is usually consistent. Just what does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman supported the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] to cut the over-all expenditure with the same provision.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Oh, the gentleman is absolutely wrong. That was not the same provision. The Pickett amendment had to do with land management. We know that that cut was made at the expense of two intangible items, namely, land classification and cadastral surveys, which are not pressing at this time. But here we are talking about orphan children, even though they are Indians. Surely, the gentleman cannot place the two in the same category. I am sure that he does not, knowing him as I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask

unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I do not come to the well of the House very often, and when I do I usually speak extemporaneously. I realize it is a little more interesting when a Member does that, but I have some very interesting figures and facts that I would like to call to the attention of the membership, and I have prepared a statement and have taken a little time to make investigation in regard to these facts and figures. I verily believe they are true. I suggest that you check them as I want the Record to be correct as to them. I think some very erroneous impressions have been going around about the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

None of us is going to uphold the Bureau of Indian Affairs, or any other bureau, in any wrong doing. I am as much interested as any Member of this Congress in ferreting out any corruption or malfeasance or misfeasance or incompetency, and trying to get rid of it. But sometimes we get started talking about things and just assume that something is true and keep on until we really dig into it and then find that our first impression is wrong.

Let me give you some facts and figures:

First. The Indian Bureau is the governmental agency rendering to Indians substantially all of the manifold services which the ordinary citizen receives from Federal, State, county, and municipal agencies, and other public and private organizations.

Second. There is one Indian Service employee for about every 34 Indians. On January 1, 1951, there was a total of 12,661 full- and part-time employees paid from Federal funds, and in round numbers, 427,000 Indians, including Alaska natives.

Third. However, this apparently is not such a startling figure. Time, the weekly news magazine for April 25, 1949, reported:

A total of 6,083,000 United States residents (1 in 9.4 wage earners) work for the Government (Federal, State, local), according to the latest count.

The total United State population in 1948—Census Bureau estimates, reported in 1949 Information Please Almanac—was 146,471,000. If we divide this population by the 6,083,000 Government employees, we find that for the United States at large there was 1 public employee for every 24 citizens.

The committee itself has already cut the Indian Bureau appropriation down from about \$75,000,000 in round figures last year to \$65,000,000—a cut of about \$10,000,000.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think we should differentiate in the minds of the membership that there is a great difference between cutting off the Bureau and cutting off the Indians.

Mr. MORRIS. Certainly; but if we cut off the Bureau we will not only cut off but we will kill some of the Indians. They cannot live without the Bureau unless we set up something else in its stead which might take us many years to properly do. Yes, if that came about we not only would cut them off but we would kill them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. To revert to the Indian Service figures:

The 12,661 employees I have mentioned can be broken down into 9,232 full-time civil-service employees, and 3,429 part-time workers. The civil-service employees include teachers, matrons, dormitory attendants, housekeepers, bus drivers, cooks, and similar employees in the 88 boarding and 243 day schools; doctors, nurses, nurses' aides, cooks, technicians, and other hospital employees in 63 hospitals and in general health work; engineers, draftsmen, extension workers, foresters, carpenters, firemen, truck drivers, clerks, stenographers, bookkeepers, auditors, welfare workers, supervisors, reservation superintendents, and other technicians and administrative employees. These employees perform the functions of the Government workers as described by the Time article.

The part-time employees include construction workers, truck and tractor drivers, and unskilled workers employed on new construction projects such as buildings, roads, dams, irrigation ditches, and similar specific and nonrecurring projects. These part-time employees compare to the employees of private contractors who build our public buildings, schools, roads, irrigation works, and so forth, and who would not normally be counted as citizens working for the Government. It may be noted also that most employees in these groups are Indians and that such employment is the only source of income available in many of the isolated areas where Indians live.

The ratio of full-time civil service employees to the estimated total number of Indians is 1 to 46, about half the ratio of Government employees to the general population.

The suggestion that current appropriations for the administration of Indian affairs, if used as per capita payments, would enable the Indians to live in comparative luxury, is made without any consideration of the many treaty rights of the Indians which the United States is duty-bound to fulfill. Furthermore, the services such as health, education, and welfare that are furnished to the Indians through these appropriations are similar to those furnished the general public. If they were not furnished by the Indian Service, the funds required to furnish them would have to be provided to the other agencies of the Government that would be called upon

to furnish them if the Indians were to receive similar services.

The available appropriations for the Bureau for fiscal year 1951 are as follows:

Health, education, and welfare services	\$39,732,328
Resources management	10,614,576
Administration	3,580,000
	53,926,904
Construction	19,137,651
Revolving loan fund and payment to Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians	2,410,500
	21,548,151
Total	75,475,055

If the available funds for health, education, and welfare service and resources were paid to the approximately 427,000 Indians direct, each Indian would receive \$126.29. If all available funds including those for construction, revolving loan funds, and so forth, were distributed, each Indian would receive \$176.75. This would certainly not enable all the Indians to live in comparative luxury as claimed in the statement.

It is the current objective and policy of our Committee on Indian Affairs and the Indian Bureau apparently is going along with us, on this policy, to assist the Indians to become integrated into the social and economic life of the Nation by placing emphasis upon increasing acceptance of responsibility for self-management on the part of the Indians. Progress is also being made toward withdrawal of Federal supervision and special services in Indian affairs by inducing State, local, and other agencies to assume responsibility for providing Indians with the same services normally accorded non-Indian citizens.

I will conclude by saying that I think the present Bureau of Indian Affairs under the leadership of Dillon Myer, and I am in close touch with him, is going to make some real strides if you will give the Indian Bureau enough money to do it with.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. As long as the Congress does not set up anything to take the place of the Bureau, we would not get anywhere by cutting down these appropriations, the result being injury to the Indians, is that correct?

Mr. MORRIS. The gentleman is absolutely right and I am glad he made that statement.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. The gentleman is chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Lands?

Mr. MORRIS. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON. I wish the gentleman would tell us exactly what has been wrong the last 10 years. The chairman has confessed here in open that we are neglecting the Indians, and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE] who is quoted as being the greatest expert on

Indians in the United States, has leveled the same indictment. What are we doing that is basically wrong in not providing for the Indians?

Mr. MORRIS. What is wrong with the whole world? We are all in trouble.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is not an answer.

Mr. MORRIS. That is an answer. There is a definite improvement to be made in all of our boards and bureaus. There is definite improvement to be made in our society. The thing that has been wrong is that there has been some incompetency, no question about that, there has been probably some malfeasance, I do not know—if there is I hope it will be ferreted out and those guilty properly dealt with—and in addition to that, and this must be recognized, the Bureau is dealing with human beings and with their important and complicated problems. The Bureau is sort of like the corporal in the Army. The corporal gets complaints from his men and the officers. They get complaints from the Indians and from us. We all jump on them. I think, as a matter of fact, we have mistreated the Bureau in some respects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. The committee has pointed out that there has been negligence, almost criminal negligence, in the matter of health. There must be something basically wrong and just the general statement that the world is in trouble does not answer the question.

Mr. MORRIS. I will tell the gentleman what is wrong in this bill basically. Instead of \$65,000,000 they ought to have \$165,000,000 to really get the health and education standard of the Indians up to where it ought to be. We are not appropriating enough money for these poor Indian people, that is all there is to it.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. REGAN. Does this \$65,000,000 include the \$10,000,000 we are spending on the Navajos and the Hopis?

Mr. MORRIS. It includes that portion of it which comes from the rehabilitation program, as I understand it, and the portion they ordinarily get.

Mr. REGAN. We have passed a law appropriating some \$90,000,000 for the benefit of these two tribes.

Mr. MORRIS. That is correct.

Mr. REGAN. The \$65,000,000 will not cut into that?

Mr. MORRIS. This is what happens in regard to that: Under the cut that the House Appropriations Committee made on the Indian Bureau, it will affect the Navajo-Hopi rehabilitation program as follows: The original request for the Navajo-Hopi rehabilitation program as submitted by the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget

was \$6,784,000. Under the cut as made by the Appropriations Committee of \$2,-262,500 there is left a net authorization of \$4,521,500 for the Navajo-Hopi long-range program. This is as the bill now stands.

Mr. REGAN. What is the source of the information in reference to the 6,-000,000 Government employees? I heard we only had 2,200,000.

Mr. MORRIS. The source of it, as I said, was Time magazine. To bring it up to date I called the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress yesterday to bring the figures up to date and here is the information I received:

Total Federal, State, and local employees as of October 1, 1950, 6,423,000.

Census, United States and Territories, 1950, 153,693,000; making a ratio of one to 23.93, or one to a little less than 24.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, this is the third day that we have been discussing this bill and it is now after 3 o'clock. There is no amendment pending. I wonder if it would be in order for me to suggest that the Clerk again read. I do not want to cut anybody off, Mr. Chairman, but it looks as if we ought to get through with the bill today if we can.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment to that paragraph.

Mr. NORRELL. I withdraw my request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply sympathetic with the gentleman from Arkansas, and I can understand why he desires to limit debate. All afternoon I have been sitting here listening to this debate. I have heard the comments of the chairman as well as the members of the subcommittee and those not on the subcommittee raising particular need with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the manner in which it is being conducted. Well, I asked the question of one of my colleagues here as to who the Administrator of this Bureau was and I was informed that it was a gentleman by the name of Dillon Myer. And, I said, I can now understand why you are having difficulty with the administration of that Bureau; why you are dissatisfied. Is he not the same gentleman who handled the Japanese detention camps, and did not the military police testify that they had more trouble with him than they had with all the Japanese combined? Is not this the same Dillon Myer who bungled the housing business? Is he not the same gentleman who was in charge of this inter-American relations program and made a mess of that?

I am not suggesting corruption or graft. However, I am not only suggesting but I am charging gross incompetence and mismanagement of this Bureau. His past performance is a guarantee of inefficiency here. But, what do you expect when Mr. Big on Pennsylvania Avenue, refuses to turn his back on people like the gentleman in charge?

You can understand why governmental departments are in difficulty not only in domestic affairs, but in world affairs as well, when the gentleman in charge of the whole works refuses to turn his back on people who are doing the kind of a job that this gentleman has done uniformly on every job that he has had anything to do with. The Indians have hired lawyers to fight their cases, and he is giving them as stiff a battle as he can. As long as you have incompetence sitting on the throne you will have what all these Members complain of. I have not heard but one good word spoken for the gentleman running this show and that came from my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think it would be helpful to the House if the gentleman would give the House a bill of particulars as to what this individual, Mr. Myer, has been doing that is so wrong.

Mr. BENDER. I wonder where the gentleman has been for the last 3 hours. Has he not heard the complaints that have been made from all quarters?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Of course, we have not had this item under consideration for 3 hours. If you look at page 6 of the report, I am amazed to find the gentleman raising the question about Indian lawyers. There is some very interesting bit of information called to our attention where the Commissioner has moved in against certain attorneys that are trying to charge the Indians fees for rendering no service.

Mr. BENDER. I do not know anything about the kind of lawyer referred to. Any lawyer that charges a fee and does not render a service is not rendering a service, I am not for a shyster. I am not defending lawyers of that kind, but somebody should defend the Indians against the management of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Will anyone here say that the job is being done well, with the exception of the gentleman from Oklahoma? He is the only person who has defended the man in charge of this Bureau.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. No, I will not yield.

This man is just not the right man for the job.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to these general allegations for some time. It is rather interesting that, in charging the present Commissioner with misconduct, Members of the House are not fair enough to render a bill of particulars and say wherein he has been engaged in misconduct. That is the only fair thing to do.

I was rather amazed to find that they are criticizing the Commissioner for taking action against certain attorneys who are not properly protecting the rights of the Indians. If you will refer to page 6 of the report, you will see that the committee has commended the Commissioner for going after some unscrupulous attorneys.

I know that in the past there have been some things in the Bureau that were not right, and they probably may still be going on. We want to ferret them out. I know the present Commissioner is doing a sincere job in trying to eliminate those activities that are not in the best interests of the Indians and not in the best interests of the Government.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. I think the gentleman is making an extraordinarily fine statement. I will say to the distinguished gentleman and to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] who just left the floor that if he has any evidence of any kind whatsoever, we want him to bring it down to our committee, and we will be happy to make an investigation.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think that is a fair request.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. I happen to be a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs. I want to commend the Commissioner on his stand in taking the position he has in respect to the attorneys. It is a tragedy and it is a disgrace how the Indians are stolen blind by these attorneys. I want to commend the Commissioner for that.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to ask the gentleman from California, who just spoke, through the kindness of the gentleman from Washington, if the Commissioner just referred to by the gentleman from California is the same man referred to 5 minutes ago by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. While I knew the gentleman from Ohio was not a lawyer, I did not know he was an Indian expert.

Mr. BENDER. I am not an Indian expert, but I can read and write English.

Mr. ROONEY. I concede that.

Mr. BENDER. And I can even understand you, my friend.

Mr. ROONEY. I will gladly concede that, too.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Since you have asked for expert testimony, I refer the House and members of this committee to Mr. WHITTEN, a leading member of the Democratic Party, and he will give you all the information you want about the gentleman I have been discussing and

further, since the gentleman from Washington asked for a bill of particulars, here is your committee report pointing in the fourth and fifth paragraphs of page 8, that the report of the committee's investigating staff indicated that there are deficiencies in the organizational structure of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Well, who does that mean? What does the committee mean when they say that?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. If the gentleman had listened to my statement a moment when I pointed out that there are certain things still in existence which had not been corrected yet. We have a new Commissioner. He has just started to take over. He is trying to do a good job so that any existing abuses can be eliminated.

Mr. BENDER. That was over a year ago that he took over.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. No, he did not. The gentleman of course gets up and makes a general statement. He figures this is the chance to say something that will sound bad, so he is jumping on the Commissioner. He may not have liked what the Commissioner has done in the past in certain Government agencies, but that does not prove that what he is doing now is not right.

Mr. BENDER. It is very indicative. It is very indicative of what you might expect and what you will be getting.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. If the gentleman will look in the record he will find the committee commended the Commissioner for the fine job he is doing in connection with this problem of the Indian attorneys. It is very easy to get up and make general allegations without trying to substantiate them.

Mr. BENDER. Does the gentleman from Washington respect a man like Mr. WHITTEN, of Mississippi?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Certainly I respect Mr. WHITTEN, and he is not making any allegations against Commissioner Myer with reference to his work in the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. BENDER. I will be glad to give the gentleman a testimonial from Mr. WHITTEN.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Ohio has the evidence, of course he would present it to the House. The only fair thing to do when you get up and make an allegation against a man in public office is to be fair enough to give the information to the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. My experience has been that where there are certain unscrupulous persons who are against the head of an agency, in their opera-

tions they usually go to someone to try and knock down the head of the agency by general, vague statements. I am sure the gentleman from Ohio is not that type of an individual, in the case of the unscrupulous lawyers, that the Commissioner has sought to get rid of.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. I wonder if that is why this committee made this report in the manner in which they did, and why we have had so many testimonials here as to the inefficiency and incompetency of the present Director?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I have yet to listen to a charge giving specific information against Commissioner Myer in the handling of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to point this out, that during all the time that Dillon Myer was the head of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], as was his right and duty, investigated him most thoroughly and sought on this floor at various times to discredit Dillon Myer and the appropriations for the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. But the gentleman from New York has not been successful and I have never seen any direct proof here on the floor of the House or in the Committee of the Whole which would reflect in the slightest upon the integrity of Commissioner Dillon Myer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not come to the well of this House for the purpose of incrimination or personalities, or in an effort to place blame upon anyone except ourselves.

In 1934, some time before I came into the House, a bill was pushed through at the end of the session, known as the Wheeler-Howard Act. Under that bill a large part of the Indian population of this country was pushed back onto the reservations under what proved to be a clearly socialist method of life. A great many of the tribes had the wisdom not to sign it, but others, unfortunately, were talked into it and have regretted it ever since.

I think that all of us, if we are honest with ourselves, must recognize the fact our native Indians have been treated shockingly by the Congress of the United States from the beginning. We have treaties with them, and in some instances we have walked roughshod over these. I sat up there in the gallery for 10 years before I became a Member of this House, and I have seen claims come up in this Congress. Consistently those claims have taken from the Indians and given to the white man. When some of his good land was taken from him, he was compensated with rocks, shale, and poor soil.

I had occasion as a member of the National Organization for Public Health

Nursing to share in a study that was made at the request of the Public Health Division of the Government, of the health of the Indians. There were two copies of that report. I read one of them, which naturally belonged to the organization which made it. The other report was in the Public Health Division, and we were implored to keep it quiet, so shocking was it. Unfortunately, we agreed to do that. We were a little, tiny organization unversed in political methods and believing that the Government would take hold and improve the conditions. We knew our business. We knew health, and we learned to know the misuse of various health promises—the camouflage, and all the rest of it.

In the Navajo country, what did the Bureau do? Did they meet the need? Which was for fertilization of the soil, for teaching the Navajo new methods of breeding better horses. Their wealth was in horses, and they got poorer every year. But what did the Bureau do? They built a capitol building for some \$8,000,000. The excuse was that this would give jobs to the Navajos—the Navajos, who ranged the plains. They put them inside a building doing all sorts of menial jobs. As it happened, I was down there and had a very vivid reaction myself as to what was going on and what was being done to our Indians.

I served on the Indian Affairs Committee the first year I was in this House, and I know a great deal about what went on. I know something of what was permitted in the matter of peyote. That could have been handled. I know much that I have never said because I have been hoping that the Congress of the United States would take the matter in hand and see to it that we did the honorable, decent, and constructive thing for a great and dignified people whom we had dispossessed when we came in here.

I think all of us would do well to do what has been done once in a while by a small group of people really interested in the well-being of the Indians; namely, learn first-hand something about the whole situation. I do not care whether this attorney or that attorney is rotten. I am not interested in that. I am interested in the Indians whom we have dispossessed, whom we have cheated, from whom we have stolen, though we do not call it by that term. I am interested in seeing the Congress of the United States finally do justice to the Indian.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to pay tribute to and congratulate the gentleman from Ohio for the finest, most intelligent, and constructive talk I think that was ever given in this House on the American Indian and about the American Indian.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to say anything on this bill, but when they come in here and are going to shoot all the lawyers. I have to object, because I

have been a kind of innocent and inoffensive lawyer for a long time, and I have no particular desire to be shot. If you would only go half way, though, I would not object—very much. You had better not shoot all the lawyers, because some of the rest of you may need a lawyer if you are going to stay here in Congress.

I venture to say I know something about this Indian question, for I was raised with them and have lived with them for 70 years—the wildest Indians on the American Continent. The purpose of the Bureau, as I understand now, is to civilize the Indian and make him a part of the general population. We have discovered that you can get rid of the Indian Bureau, if that is what you object to, just as fast as you prepare these Indians to sustain themselves. We have tried that out in North Dakota. This Congress, fortunately, has appropriated money to allow these Indians to restock their land with cattle. Out of 64 examples of that kind, of the Government giving the Indians cattle superintended by the Indians themselves, there have only been two failures and no losses on those failures, because the Indian inspectors saw the Indians would not take care of their cattle and took the cattle away from them before there was any loss. That is a great investment for the Government and a better investment for the Indian, because I know a lot of Indians out there who have some self-respect now; they do not owe anything; they own their herd of cattle, and they are sending their children to school just like the rest of the people, and they are honorable citizens. If that is the way it can be done, this Congress ought to remember that what will apply to one tribe might apply to another.

In another county in North Dakota we decided to try the matter of the administration of justice and keep the Federal Government out. An act was passed in Congress giving that county jurisdiction, criminal and civil, over the Indians if accepted by the county. One county accepted it, and they have got along in the administration of justice all right. But you see the unfairness of it, because over half of that reservation is not taxed; the Government still owns that land in fee for the Indians; it is not taxed. Hence, in that county the rest of the taxpayers are paying the expense of the administration of justice over all of the county. If this Congress in its wisdom in cases like that would provide that wherever there is a large holding of Indian lands in many counties like in my State where some of the counties are probably 20 percent Indian lands untaxed, if those counties would be allowed, in lieu of these taxes, compensation from the Government, you would have no more problem about the administration of justice, school administration, or any other administration that the State or the National Government affords the people of North Dakota in general.

You can work this out, and the reason why some of you are mad at the Indian Commissioner is because of the system. At one time I was mad at an Indian Commissioner years ago, wanted to get rid of him; and they got another one, and he

was worse than the first one. Now, then, get rid of this one and you will have another who is worse. It is the system you are driving at, not the man. It is the responsibility of this Congress. Who is it that keeps this system in operation today? It is the Congress. You do not give the Indians a chance to get out from under it. The only thing they have is the present system.

I do not know who is responsible for all of the scallawagging that has been handed the Indians in the last 150 years, but I do know it was not the lawyers of North Dakota who did it. I do know that the Turtle Mountain Indians in my State owned one-fourth of North Dakota and they owned it since 1783, but the Congress maneuvered this land away from them by purported treaties, allowing them 10 cents per acre.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the support of the gentleman from Missouri. I was about to say something about him, but I shall not do so now.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I think the Members of the House would be interested in having the gentleman, who has the greatest knowledge of Indians and the history of the Indians of any man in America and who can speak the Indian sign language, take about a minute to explain the Indian sign language. Maybe we could go out among these Indians, and they would appreciate us a little bit more. I know when the gentleman goes out among the Indians they have a great time, and he helps the Indians a lot. I would like to ask the gentleman what is the name the Indians baptized him? Or did they baptize the gentleman?

Mr. BURDICK. No.

Mr. JENSEN. What is the gentleman's Indian name?

Mr. BURDICK. The Indians have always had too much respect for me to make me a chief of their tribe. They only do that with the sucker who gives them some money.

Mr. JENSEN. I would like to have the gentleman give us the philosophy of an Indian. The gentleman knows exactly how the Indians feel about the Government of the United States.

Mr. BURDICK. I could give an illustration.

Mr. ROONEY. Before the gentleman does so, will he explain the sign language that he conveyed just a few moments ago to the gentleman from Iowa? Was the gesture not what is commonly known as the hook?

Mr. BURDICK. Of course, everybody can understand the sign language. It is

not difficult to understand, because everything is natural, even some of the most difficult signs. You are in a store and make a dicker for merchandise. Do you want it? The answer is, bring it over. If you do not want it, it is the other way around. You would be surprised to know that all of you can learn the sign language in 3 days.

Where was I when I got off the track? What was I talking about?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman was talking about Indian ownership of land in his State.

Mr. BURDICK. I want to tell you about the Indians and the Indian Bureau. I asked an Indian at a meeting one time to tell me his view of the Indian Bureau. He says, "I will tell you what it is." He was talking the Sioux language.

He says, "I can demonstrate it to you. Another Indian and myself were traveling along the road one day and I saw a coconut fall off a wagon. I said, 'What is that?' The other Indian picked it up. I said, 'Give it to me. I saw it first.' 'No,' he says, 'I got it first.'

"So we, the two Indians, began fighting and a white man came along. He said to the Indians: 'You should not fight. Let me settle it for you. If I decide it will you accept it?'"

"We said, 'Yes.'"

They would rather do that than to have a fight.

So he said, "The white man took the coconut, bored a hole in it first, drank the milk out of it; then he cut the coconut in two and took the meat out, and gave one Indian half of the shell and the other one the other half of the shell. Now, he says, 'I have settled that for you.'"

The Indian told me, "That is the way the Indian Bureau does. They get all the meat and all the milk and we get the shell."

That is the Indians' view.

In the Turtle Mountain region that I was talking about when you interfered with me, they owned one-quarter of the State of North Dakota, and by successive treaties, which were never agreed to by the Indians, they have got 9,000 Indians now backed up on two of the poorest townships of land in the State of North Dakota. Just think of 9,000 Indians on two townships of stony land when they once owned the whole territory. The Government claims they bought it for 10 cents an acre, but the Indians never signed the treaty at all, and that case is now pending before the Court of Claims. I just want to show you that there are some Indians ready for self-government, and some are not. There are some Indians ready to be released, and I think the Sioux Indians of my State are ready because they have demonstrated that they can be self-supporting. Many of them have held offices. We have had sheriffs and other county officials who were Indians. If this Congress wants to help the Indians, make them appropriations so they can help themselves.

If you cut this appropriation you are not getting rid of the Indian Bureau but that cut will fall to the loss of some

important service necessary for their becoming independent and successful citizens. It would be a severe blow if the cutting of this appropriation would in any way interfere with the educational and health programs. Education is the answer to the whole Indian question. That includes manual training and preparation for individual freedom. There is nothing that is more dignified in this world than the ownership of property and the sense of responsibility as a citizen. The Indians of the United States have made a great contribution to our frequent war efforts, and if we can send them forth to war we ought to be willing to send them forth as able, dignified citizens and permit them to take their place among the diversity of nationalities making up this great Republic of freedom.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has again expired.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I thoroughly enjoyed the remarks of the gentleman from North Dakota and other remarks that have been made here, particularly by the gentlewoman from Ohio. I do not pose as an expert on Indian affairs. However, in early 1945 I was asked by a magazine for which I worked to make a survey of the Indian reservations with a view of a rather complete report and a series of articles on the subject of the American Indian. I traveled over 5,000 miles and visited most of the Indian reservations of the Middle West and the West.

I came to the conclusion that it was time to set the American Indian free. Regardless of all that may come from this discussion, it seems to me that the gentleman from North Dakota in his closing remarks touched upon the thing that Congress should address itself to from now on, and that is to provide ways and means for turning the American Indians loose, for getting them off of their reservations, and out from under Federal jurisdiction.

I recently asked the Indian Bureau for some statistics. Back in 1945 I asked the Indian Bureau how many Indians we had in this country and I was informed that there were 260,000. Recently I asked the Bureau how many Indians we now have, and I was informed that there were 393,622. Obviously, then, the number has increased greatly in 6 years.

You will recall perhaps that back in 1925 the Congress of the United States passed an act which declared that the Indian should have full citizenship. It was contemplated at that time and the promise made to the American people that the efforts of our Government would be turned toward bringing the Indians into full American life, along with full citizenship. The record that has been written not simply by the Indian Bureau but by Congress has been one of failure to accomplish that purpose.

In 1933 a movement was started under Commissioner Collier to return the Indians to the reservations. That is virtually what the Wheeler-Howard Act mentioned by the gentlewoman from

Ohio meant to do. From that time on our expenditures have increased year by year. In 1925 we had 4,700 employees in the Indian Bureau. In 1932 we had 8,000. In 1945 the number had grown to 12,000. In 1951 it is a little more than 13,000.

The expenditures have increased accordingly. In 1945, when I made this study, we were spending approximately \$31,000,000 a year for the Indians. Now we are asking more than double that amount. Yet we were promised in 1945, when this study was made, that progressively the Indian Bureau would work toward liberating the Indians and setting them free.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the primary task over and beyond the appropriation of money is to work progressively toward, as the gentleman from North Dakota indicated, settling the claims, getting the Indians who are capable of managing their own affairs out from under the restrictions of the Federal Government, and then letting these services that are now being handled by the Bureau be handled by the States and the agencies of local government.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I have taken quite an interest in Indian affairs over a period of time. I have a few Indians in my district. I served as chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs in the Seventy-ninth Congress. I agree with what the gentleman has said.

He may be interested in knowing that I have talked to the new Commissioner, Mr. Myer, and I believe it is safe to say that what the gentleman has said is pretty much in accordance with his views on trying to emancipate the Indians that are ready for emancipation. We have thousands of Indians in the United States that can be released to operate their own affairs. It has been a struggle all down through the years even to get the Bureau to permit the Indian children to go to the local public schools. Instead, they wanted to set up their own schools. However, the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs, in my humble opinion, is trying to do his very, very best to bring about the objectives the gentleman has in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I greatly appreciate the remarks of the gentleman. I am wondering if those of us who want to go along with whatever appropriation is needed, despite the fact that it seems that every year it increases, can have some assurance that the leadership in this House will move to do this job? Will they provide the legislation that will be necessary to start in motion the gradual liquidation of this Bureau of Indian Affairs and turn the affairs of the Indians over to them as rapidly as they can manage them?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. On page 5 of the committee report reference is made to that situation:

Although recognizing the necessity to provide material assistance, the committee feels that increasing emphasis must be placed on active, tangible progress toward the assimilation of Indians into the general population. Unless this is done the Indians will inevitably continue in their dependent status and will never be able to fully enjoy the privileges and opportunities of American citizenship.

About 4 years ago I cosponsored with Senator O'MAHONEY a bill providing for the settlement of Indian claims. I believe that measure is a long step forward in getting the Indian away from the reservation. The big problem in settling this whole question is the fact that you have within the Bureau of Indian Affairs a certain group of shall we say professionals, who have stayed on all during the years and who do not want to see the Indians leave because they are trying to hold onto their jobs.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is right.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is the basic difficulty.

Let me say that in all sincerity I have discussed this matter time and time again with Commissioner Myer. It is his desire to see to it that the key people within the Bureau of Indian Affairs are people who are dedicated to the philosophy of making the Indians first-class citizens, to be assimilated into the local communities, and avoiding wardship where there is absolutely no need for it. There are a number of Indians in the United States, unfortunately, that are not eligible for release at this time. We have thousands of them in New Mexico and Arizona, as the gentleman knows, that cannot read and write the English language.

That is a sad commentary on our civilization.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is a great authority on the Indians and has made quite a study of their problems.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am not an authority, but I have tried to understand their problems.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that wherever you find good soil you do not find any Indian problem?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Good soil certainly helps to solve the problem, because they can make a living as a result.

Mr. JENSEN. Every place where we have good soil for the Indians we have no Indian problem whatever. Here we let the soil on the reservations go to pot year in and year out and spend very little money to build up the soil and the problem is becoming worse and worse each year.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is true.

Mr. JENSEN. I contend, and I can prove it, that wherever we have poor soil in any Indian reservation we have a terrible Indian problem.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. There must be some Indians who still want just to be Indians the way they always have and live according to their own customs and laws. Do you propose by your method to force them compulsorily to Americanize or will you then have the community swallow those people, too? Is there any room for them?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I will say to the gentleman that certainly those Indians who want to retain their ancient culture and ways of life should be permitted to do so, but they can do that without the supervision of a Federal bureau.

Mr. FULTON. On the changing over to State and local control would you have any protection so that those State and local authorities might not be trying to take over very valuable rights, either in land or leases?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Certainly those protections should be accorded the Indians so long as they are needed.

Mr. FULTON. And the protection of their titles?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Certainly.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We have this problem, and I think the solution must lie in the Congress, and I ask it as a question of the gentleman, even where there is good land, as the gentleman from Iowa said, in the emancipation of the Indians progress has been very difficult in the Bureau of Indian Affairs to release the Indian completely. They still feel they must always hold some sort of trusteeship and that the Indian is not quite ready yet for freedom. I think the gentleman will agree with me in that case Congress must act.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

(Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, in Alaska there are many Indians, many Eskimos and some Aleuts. That accounts for my being in almost daily contact with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I think I know something of the way they operate there. My experience with Dillon Myer has been limited to the time since he took office as Commissioner of Indian Affairs in May of last year. On the basis of that experience I want to say I consider him to be an outstanding public servant. Mr. Myer is being quite strongly criticized here today. I think a great deal of the criticism stems from the fact that he is trying to cut out some of the underbrush which has impeded the bureau which he heads, over a long period of time. More particularly I want to suggest that some of the attorney groups are most concerned with Mr. Myer's administration. As has been suggested in the report made by the subcommittee on page 6, the subcommittee commends the Commissioner for looking into this situation. I believe the fact

he is doing so, in harmony with the belief of the subcommittee that something should be done, is the reason why he is under attack right now. It was indicated a while ago that the Commissioner had not done anything to follow out the report of the House Appropriations' investigating committee.

In that connection I call attention to page 243 of the hearings where it was demonstrated that Mr. Myer had not, until the time of the hearing itself, been informed of the report. The debate shows that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] asked this question:

Mr. JENSEN. How long have you been Commissioner?

Mr. MYER. Since the 8th of May 1950.

Mr. JENSEN. Approximately 10½ months?

Mr. MYER. About 10 months; a little over.

Mr. JENSEN. You say that you have not read this report?

Mr. MYER. I have not had an opportunity to see it.

Mr. JENSEN. Has any member of your staff?

Mr. MYER. It has not been provided to us.

Mr. JENSEN. No one has seen it?

Mr. MYER. No one has had a chance to see the report.

Mr. FURCOLO. I think the record should show that the committee has not given them a copy of the report.

I believe the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] was eternally right when he said it was the fault of the system, not of any Commissioner; that no Commissioner regardless of his capabilities, could on his own motion change that system.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am happy to hear the gentleman's observation regarding Mr. Myer. One may differ with Dillon Myer but he is the kind of man, if I am a correct judge, who would quickly respond to any mandate of this Congress, and would try to carry out our policy. Whatever our differences with him, it seems to me he is a man of complete integrity. I knew him before I was elected to Congress. He is the kind of man who enjoys working with and for disadvantaged people. I am pleased to hear the gentleman from Alaska express himself as he has with reference Mr. Myer's honor and capacity for public service.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am glad to have the gentleman from Arkansas say that. I think Mr. Myer has done a first-class job in the Bureau of Indian Affairs; but, as was indicated by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], unless the Congress itself changes the system, any Commissioner is bound to follow the laws laid down by the Congress, and he can do nothing more. If the Indians are not getting a fair deal, if a different philosophy should guide our relations with the Indians, then it is up to the Congress to spell that out in a legislative manner. Until that time comes any Commissioner must proceed according to the legislation which he has before him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alaska has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction: For construction, major repair, and improvement of irrigation and

power systems, buildings, utilities, roads and trails, and other facilities; acquisition of lands and interests in lands; preparation of lands for farming; and architectural and engineering services by contract; to remain available until expended, \$12,000,000, of which not to exceed \$3,125,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted: *Provided*, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside or outside the boundaries of existing reservations.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the discussion today with a great amount of interest. For several years, while a member of the State Legislature in California, delegations of Indians have come by way of Sacramento, traveling back to Washington to endeavor to secure the rights and privileges for their own people. I am highly satisfied with the discussion I have heard here by members of the committee. I feel they are interested, but I will subscribe to the fact that the system must be wrong, because I do not believe you are accomplishing the things which you pretend to do.

In 1949 I introduced a bill authorizing the construction of a school for the Hopi Indian Reservation in California. It passed and was signed by the President. Moneys were provided in the budget for the construction of those facilities. When the freeze came on it was stricken out. The Indian Bureau has registered its approval of this school facility, but I find that this year it has again been eliminated.

I have traveled throughout the Indian reservations in my State, and the greatest thing that the Indians demand out there is that their children be given half a chance, along with American children, for an education. We are not giving them a proper break. In the State of California we have assumed the responsibility for the education of the Indians, but on these reservations they cannot construct a school building, it is a Federal charge.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCUDDER. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. I ask the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER] if it is not a fact that failure of the Federal Government to meet its obligation to its wards, namely the Indians, has placed that obligation upon the taxpayers of the State of California and placed it there improperly? That is what the gentleman is objecting to, is it not?

Mr. SCUDDER. I am not objecting to that; it is perfectly all right for the State of California to assume this obligation, but in the Hoopa Indian Reservation there is not enough taxable property to raise above \$1,000 a year.

The Federal Government owes the Indians school facilities. It is an obligation. There are 3,900 Indians on the reservation. Last year the auditorium was destroyed by fire. They have an old shack that has been there for the last 70 years in which the children go to school, some of the finest youngsters you could find anywhere, and we are not giving them a proper chance.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCUDDER. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. The fact that there is not any tangible value in the reservation makes it impossible for any local school agency to raise the necessary funds to build the necessary school facilities to give the children proper education.

Mr. SCUDDER. The gentleman is right, and there is no way in which the State of California can provide any of their public moneys to be spent for buildings on Federal lands. Again, we have been excluded from having proper facilities for those children. I think it is disgraceful.

I talked to a chief on a reservation, who lives a short distance from Hoopa, and he said to me: "We do not want any money, if we can be assured that our children will be properly educated and given a chance. We have had our day; we are interested only in the children coming on." I believe that this Congress is responsible for the education of these youngsters, and while we are appropriating money to be sent all over the world I think we should consider somewhat those people to whom we do owe a responsibility. I am very happy that the group of men serving on this Committee on Indian Affairs seem to take a sympathetic interest. But something is stopping you. Possibly it is the system, but for goodness sake, let us try to correct this injustice.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, now that everybody has spoken kindly and very highly of the Indians—and I believe there is no one who has spoken who did not speak kindly of them—I ask that the Clerk be allowed to read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except the revolving fund for loans) shall be available for purchase of not to exceed 270 passenger motor vehicles, of which 191 shall be for replacement only, which may be used for the transportation of Indians; purchase of ice for official use of employees; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including not to exceed \$5,000 for expenditure at rates for individuals not in excess of \$100 per diem on irrigation and power matters, when authorized by the Secretary; and expenses required by continuing or permanent treaty provisions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: On page 12, line 7, strike out "227" and insert "191."

(Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 10 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of asking the Committee's time uselessly. I think this amendment is so simple that it does not require much explanation. It is the second of a series of amendments which I have prepared, intended to cut out the expenditure of public funds for additional automobiles for the various agencies in the Interior Department.

I attempted to find in the committee hearings some justification for the increased number of automobiles requested by the various bureaus and agencies in the Department of the Interior. After going through 1800 pages of the hearings and testimony I found one reference to automobiles, and that on page 1800. The sole justification I can find for these additional automobiles which these agencies are asking for is the fact they want them, and the Bureau of the Budget recommended that they be allowed. The Bureau of Indian Affairs, according to the table on page 1800, already has 1627 automobiles. We are providing in this legislation for the replacement of 199 of the 1,627 automobiles; and, in addition, the committee bill would give them 36 more. The amendment which I have offered, and which I think is very reasonable, merely cuts off the 36 additional automobiles but permits for the replacing of 191 of these old ones.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. Chairman, the Indian Bureau asked for 287 automobiles. We cut that to 227. In other words, we cut out 60 automobiles. If we cut them down to 80 someone probably would offer an amendment to cut more out. But we have cut out 60 already.

Now, on these Indian reservations where there is a great deal of sand and no highways, the tires and all parts of the automobiles wear out very fast.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. My amendment allows for replacement.

Mr. KIRWAN. But the gentleman wants to cut out the purchase of some cars. How many would the gentleman's amendment cut out?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It would be 36 by this amendment.

Mr. KIRWAN. All right. We cut them down 60 cars. I heard a number of Members here this afternoon speak highly of the Indians. Yet, if you want to see an Indian, or if somebody gets word that something is wrong with an

Indian and wants to look at him, there would be no transportation. This is not for one little area. This is for all over the Western States.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 12, line 12, strike out the word "including" and the remainder of line 12, all of line 13, and the words "excess of \$100" in line 14.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is similar to an amendment I offered to another section of this bill earlier in the day and is intended to limit the per diem payment for extra individuals. It strikes out \$100 per day for the extra persons that you would employ in this Bureau under this legislation and limits their payment to \$50 per day.

I want to find out whether this great Committee is going to insist on \$100 per day for extra persons who are employed without any restrictions concerning their ability or qualifications. Of course, under this bill you leave that entirely to the head of the Bureau, or someone who represents him.

This amendment applies to an agency headed by Mr. Dillon Myer. There is practically nothing in the hearings to support the need of this extra employment at the rate of \$100 per day. I do not believe a case has been made to support it. You ought to vote for my amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I do not believe I understood from the reading of the amendment by the Clerk just how far the gentleman strikes out by his amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am just striking out that portion which says in substance that you can pay \$100 a day for individuals to work for this particular Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman intend to strike out the figure \$5,000 there, too?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; that is the intention, and \$100 a day.

Mr. KEATING. I think perhaps the gentleman might want to look at his amendment again. It struck me, as the Clerk read it that perhaps it did not carry out the intention of the gentleman.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, it does. It strikes out the \$5,000 and \$100 per day. If not we will amend it to limit the total amount to \$5,000 and \$100 per day.

There is nothing more that I care to say about this amendment. If you want to go along and pay these extra employees money without requiring qualification of any kind, that is up to you. But, I think this is a pretty good chance

to determine whether you want to follow that principle or not.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 9 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas is similar to the amendment that he offered in connection with the Bonneville Power Administration. You will note that the expenditure here is limited to the power and irrigation activities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. This is another example where careless amendments can bring about the reverse effect of economy. The gentleman from Kansas by his amendment has removed the limitation. You see, he has in effect brought about a situation where they spend any amount of money at \$50 a day. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Of course, the gentleman said earlier in the day that there was no particular limitation with respect to the use of these funds that is to say, they could use them almost whenever they cared with reference to this particular agency.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The committee placed a limitation on the amount of money that could be spent both on Bonneville and the Indian Bureau. We limited it here to \$5,000. Now the gentleman by his amendment has removed the entire limitation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And says they cannot hire these people.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. No; you have not. You better read your amendment. I will stand on that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

(Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I am against permitting a salary of \$100 a day for experts.

Mr. Chairman, I object to the principle and the precedent that is being set in this legislation and I think it would be wise to limit the per diem to around \$43 to \$50 a day.

Further, there are no qualifications set up in this bill to determine what constitutes an expert in his profession. The department head can employ anyone as an expert at \$100 a day.

I am of the opinion that if you need expert engineering to help the United States Army Engineers, who are supposed to be experts in the first place and capable of any construction that our Government needs, that you ought to be

able to get these men for \$43 to \$50 a day.

You are setting a ceiling here of \$100 a day. I think you are laying yourselves and the Government, so to speak, open so that men can be appointed and doubtless will be appointed in many instances that are not experts but men who are probably recommended for these jobs as political favors. I think there is a chance for great abuse when you raise the ceiling to \$100 a day. I think there is a chance that the Government will not get value received. I doubt the necessity of it. I think it is establishing a very bad precedent. I hope you will limit the amount by approving this amendment.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. If you went to my home town of Pittsburgh and offered \$50 a day, you would not have a possible chance of getting a single qualified expert in any technical field for that sum. You might get one from the gentleman's State or his district; but in my district you would not have a chance of getting a single applicant.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise first to ask some questions.

The rate of \$100 a day for 300 working days a year would be at the rate of \$30,000 a year. Is not that pretty good for an expert, even if he is an expert on Indian affairs?

Second, I understand there are something over 300,000 Indians and we have about 12,000 people working in the Bureau. May I ask if that is not correct? We have 12,000 employees, and I think that is 1 for every 34 Indians.

Mr. MORRIS. That is correct.

Mr. FULTON. How many people are usually in an Indian family, about five?

Mr. MORRIS. I am not prepared to answer for certain, but I would say probably that is correct, about four or five.

Mr. FULTON. Each employee thus services five, or at most six, Indian families in a year. In addition, the United States is getting experts at a \$30,000-a-year rate, under this proposed bill, to treat on Indian affairs, and is also getting 227 passenger cars for this purpose. I do not believe the Indians when they were living their frugal, happy life here had so many people servicing them in passenger cars, when we came to the country, so it may be a new start for them. Perhaps the Indian needs practical education so he can do things himself more than he needs perennial bureaucratic coddling. We must not forget Indians are real people, not just a repressed problem minority.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman think it would be difficult for this administration to convert a lame-duck Congressman into an Indian expert at \$100 a day, and do it rather rapidly?

Mr. FULTON. That might be a very good thing for some of them, as many leave here without much to go on, and without much to go back to, and no experts at \$100 a day to help them. I know we Congressmen are not being paid at that rate, and by the time you take our expenses into consideration, with long hours of work and pressures, we Congressmen cannot compete with such a stipend.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Perhaps that explains the \$100 a day. Then they will get expenses on top of that.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. The gentleman alludes to the gentlemen as being Indian experts. I might say, however, if \$100 a day were offered to experts on the Foreign Affairs Committee to take care of people over in foreign countries, there would not be too much objection to it.

Mr. FULTON. I think you would get objection to \$100 a day for any experts. Actually the experts on the staff hired by the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House get about one-third of that amount, without any additional allowances for expenses as here contemplated. I might say to the gentleman that if the Marshall plan was run at the rate of one Marshall-plan employee for every 34 persons helped, we certainly would have a staggering bureaucracy. The ECA is a very well-run organization, and we in Congress are proud of the job Paul Hoffman, Averill Harriman, and the present ECA Administrator Foster have accomplished.

Mr. FENTON. If they transferred some of the point 4 program for foreign fields over to the Indian country in this country we would be better off, too, I might say.

Mr. FULTON. May I point out to the gentleman that the cost of the Indian Bureau the gentleman is now defending is more than the cost of running this whole legislative body, and the other body, the Senate, for a whole year. We in Congress must see our taxpayers' money is well spent. From the debate I have heard today it seems as if the poor Indian people who have suffered much, are not getting along too well in spite of the taxpayers' assistance and generosity.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment, so that I may offer a further amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 12, line 14, strike "\$100" and insert "\$50."

The amendment was agreed to.

[Mr. JOHNSON addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of saving time and expediting the public business, I have a unanimous-consent request that I would like to propound.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I have four additional amendments to the bill, all of which are identical in purpose and intent with the two amendments which were previously adopted and which were offered by me. The purpose of those amendments is to strike out authorization of funds in this bill for the acquisition of new automobiles over and above those which are to be used as replacements. I ask unanimous consent that all four of those amendments be considered at this time as a whole, notwithstanding the fact that they are applicable to parts of the bill which have not yet been read.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would not be permissible for the Clerk to read the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the opinion of the Chair. Without objection, the Clerk will read the amendments, and then the Chair will put the request.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

Page 23, lines 21 and 22, strike out "117" and insert in lieu thereof "80."

Page 26, lines 7 and 8, strike out "151" and insert "130."

Page 29, line 9, strike out "22" and insert "19."

Page 31, line 21, strike out "85" and insert "74."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] asks unanimous consent that his four amendments be considered en bloc at this time even though the paragraphs of the bill to which the amendments refer have not yet been read.

Is there objection?

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman from Mississippi if he has in mind insofar as the Geological Survey is concerned that they have a great deal to do with the mineral resources of this country and quite directly, I think, with the defense effort and the war effort. I wonder if he might consider perhaps omitting the amendment relating to that section?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to debate these amendments further. I believe the precedent has already been set by the adoption of the other two amendments identical in purpose.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, during the reading of that part of the bill pertaining to the Indian Service, I was glad to hear so many appropriate and

worthy sentiments expressed for our Indians. Apparently there is agreement as to what we would like for the Indians, which is that they be merged into our American way of life, being relieved of wardship and brought into first-class citizenship as soon as possible. That is my sentiment along with that of many colleagues.

We are not so unanimous in our views as to the best method of obtaining this desired goal for our Indians as we are apparently unanimous in the wished-for goal for them. To illustrate my meaning, it is desirable that every individual should know how to swim but I have heard different methods of having children acquire the desired ability to swim. I have even heard it suggested: "Throw a boy into the deep water, and he will swim." I do not know how effective that training would be, and I do not know that it is often practiced, but I am doubtful about it and do not advise it. On the other hand, I believe that there are other methods of training a child to swim, both safer and more effective.

So many times I have heard well-intentioned individuals say, "Turn the Indian loose." Or "We must emancipate the Indian." The first idea is a dangerous one; the second as an idea is more acceptable to me, but I do not like the word "emancipate" with all that it connotes applied to Indians.

Time will not permit now a report which three of us in this Chamber might give, as members of the watch-dog committee on the Navajo measure appointed last year, and who have recently visited the Navajo Reservation, but I do want to say this: That your watch-dog committee paid our first hurried visit to the Navajo Reservation just before Easter and saw some evidence, both of the need and the accomplishment, on which I wish later to report more fully. Concerning Navajo life, we saw the present depth and height of their condition. We saw them in their hogans and we saw them in one of the best modern schools which has been provided very recently for them.

Let me conclude by saying that I appreciate the fact that the Indian appropriations in this bill have received better consideration at the hands of this committee than has any other part of this appropriation bill thus far read and amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

For carrying out the functions of the Bureau of Reclamation as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) and other acts and treaties applicable to that Bureau, as follows:

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS: Page 14, line 20, strike out the words "and treaties."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to support my amendment at length and with considerable persuasiveness.

I have here the treaty which I should like to read at length; I have the Boulder Dam and other documents. But in view of the fact that this is a very minor amendment and is an appendage to the more important amendment which I will offer I think perhaps our chairman might accept it.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Another year has rolled around, and we are again considering appropriations for the fiscal year. These appropriations will be for the fiscal year of 1952, beginning July 1, 1951, and ending June 30, 1952.

The Second District of Colorado is always interested in the Federal budget and appropriations, and especially funds for the Colorado-Big Thompson project.

The Colorado-Big Thompson project, one of the outstanding irrigation and reclamation programs in the entire West, is now so nearly completed—more than 60 percent—that funds for this work should not and do not fall in the category of possible or promotion projects from any angle. Consequently, the supporters of this project insist that any curtailment of funds that in anyway would delay the completion of this irrigation and power producing project would be economic folly, and produce no economy in any way in the conduct of the Federal Government.

In 1950, which would be for the fiscal year 1951, the Budget Bureau requested a total of \$21,500,000 for the Big Thompson project, and were given \$20,172,750. This was a reduction from the request of \$327,250.

This year there is included in the budget request, \$19,300,000 for the Colorado-Big Thompson project. The House Appropriations Committee has approved \$19,000,000 for the project, which is \$300,000 less than the request. Of course we still have hopes that should contracts and the program be completed faster than the funds indicate they would be, that a deficiency appropriation would be forthcoming. We all understand that our contracts lap over from year to year.

We hope the \$19,000,000 is enough to keep work in full progress during the coming 12 months.

Just to keep us all posted on what is going on in the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District, the secretary-manager, Mr. J. M. Dille, writes me as of April 13, and I quote excerpts from his letter:

Dear CONGRESSMAN HILL: It occurs to me that you will be interested in a brief résumé of progress on the Colorado-Big Thompson project.

First, as to construction, you know that Granby Reservoir, Shadow Mountain Lake, Alva B. Adams tunnel, the Estes Park aqueduct and Horsetooth Reservoir have been completed for several years.

In addition, the Granby pumping plant, Mary's Lake and Estes power plants, Horsetooth feeder canal and the Poudre supply canal leading to the Poudre River, are also now built and ready for use.

Other features in various stages of construction are the 7½ mile combined Olympus and Polehill tunnels, now excavated and being lined, the Polehill power plant, the Rattlesnake tunnel and afterbay, the Bald Mountain pressure tunnel and the Flatiron power plant.

The above are all parts of the "Foothills Power System" and the two power plants will be the largest producers in the system.

The Bureau is apparently expediting their completion as rapidly as possible.

Also, now being built are the Carter Lake Reservoir dams and the Carter Lake pressure tunnel through which the water will be pumped into Carter Lake from pumps at the afterbay of the Flatiron power plant.

Also, the Bureau is now in the process of receiving bids and awarding contracts on the Willow Creek Dam on Willow Creek and for the North Poudre gravity canal north of Fort Collins.

In a short time the Bureau will ask for bids on the St. Vrain supply canal and other smaller features.

The recent completion of work listed above makes possible partial, but substantial, operation of the project this season.

In fact, the Bureau is now pumping water from Granby Reservoir, flowing it through the Adams tunnel through the power plants in Estes Park down the Big Thompson River, and then through the Horsetooth feeder canal for storage in Horsetooth Reservoir.

The Bureau plans to continue these flows until about 35,000 acre-feet are in storage by June 1; then shut off for most of June to avoid high water in the Thompson River and resume operations in July and August. Of course, only a part of the water will have to be pumped from Granby Reservoir.

The diverted water will be available for rental through the district to irrigation systems on the Poudre and Big Thompson Rivers.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. Is the gentleman going to have water for that project? When I was out there I was told it would take 10 years to bring up enough water to take care of the project. In other words, they are pumping water uphill out there.

Mr. HILL. Well. The only thing wrong with the gentleman's statement is that he says "I was told." I am sure he is not one of those Congressmen who believes everything he is told. If he will go out there and look over the project he will find one of the large lakes is being filled rapidly. When I saw it 3 or 4 weeks ago it was almost one-third full. We have been irrigating land through that project for the last 2 years and unless California takes all of the water from the upper Basin of the Colorado-Big Thompson River we will have plenty of water to do everything planned by this project.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to direct further attention to the amendment to the bill now under consideration by the Committee, which was offered by the gentleman from Missouri

[Mr. SHORT]. Mr. SHORT's amendment reads:

On page 4, line 3, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof "Provided, That this appropriation shall not be expended for the construction of facilities designated as comprising the western Missouri project."

This amendment, if permitted to stand, will stop construction before completion on the following projects in southwestern Missouri: A transmission line from Carthage to Springfield, from Springfield to Mansfield, and from Springfield to a substation. It will also stop construction on the Mansfield switching station, the Clinton substation, and the Carthage substation.

These projects are already under construction and the total estimated cost is \$4,960,125. Of this amount, \$2,936,250 has already been appropriated and obligated. The amount requested for completion of these projects and the amount carried in the present bill is \$1,560,600. This amount would practically complete these projects. The The Short amendment does not strike out the \$1,560,600 but merely prevents this amount from being spent on the western Missouri projects. The amendment has no effect on the \$2,936,250 already provided in fiscal 1951. If allowed to stand, the Federal Government would stand to lose this \$2,936,250 by having construction on the projects stopped before their completion. Such action as the adoption of this amendment is indeed reckless and irresponsible.

I do not agree with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] that these facilities are duplication. I also do not agree that the area is at present adequately served. Neither of these contentions, duplication, or adequate service is justified by the facts in the case. The area does need additional facilities and also desperately needs a dependable source of electric energy at a reasonable cost. If this amendment stands, it means that REA in the area will be unduly restricted. It means that our rural people will not get the service they are entitled to have and the service they are willing to pay for. A vote for this amendment, regardless of how loud the contention may be proclaimed otherwise, is a vote against REA, and thus against our rural people.

I will ask for a roll call vote on this amendment in the House and sincerely hope that the membership will vote the amendment down.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, referring to page 10 of the report I see under the head of "Central Valley project" the following language is used:

Testimony indicates that \$630,000 requested for Contra Costa distribution system was to be used for initiating construction of an aqueduct to serve the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District, which is within the boundaries of the East Bay Municipal Utility District on the east side of San Francisco Bay. Owing to lack of agreement between two competing public

agencies, the \$630,000 item under reference has been deleted from the approved program.

It goes on further to deny funds for this purpose.

In reading the hearings on this matter I see that the manager of the East Bay Municipal Utility District, which serves an area in Alameda County and in Contra Costa County, with an attorney here in Washington employed by them, appeared before the committee and made certain statements that were never rebutted because no one had an opportunity to rebut them. Perhaps I should have been there. However, they cannot be borne out in fact.

It is not particularly brought out in this report or in the hearings that the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District referred to as being in conflict with the East Bay Municipal Utility District is a political subdivision of the State of California, created by initiative of the people of that district who were not satisfied with the service they were getting from the East Bay Municipal Utility District. Therefore, in order to protect their own interests they utilized California law for that purpose.

I am sorry that the committee did not have before it, or that there was not an opportunity given to representatives of the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District to appear and offer their side of the story. Knowing the subcommittee as I do, I doubt very much whether the stringent language written into this report would be there. I am pointing out to them that since the Contra Costa County canal was built a great portion of the territory at one time we thought would be agricultural land has become urban property. There will be a surplus capacity in the Contra Costa County canal, and that surplus capacity can be used to bring industrial water into one of the most rapidly growing parts of the United States.

I trust that in the future we will be able to correct the situation, but I want the RECORD to show now that I, as the representative of that district, cannot accept the conclusions of the committee. I am not charging the committee with trying to do something dishonorable, but it is my intention to lay before them in the future facts that I am certain will tend to change their mind and opinion on this matter and would have changed them if the matter had not been heard in an ex parte manner.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. Nobody appeared before the committee and asked for this particular appropriation except the Department of the Interior, and we did have gentlemen from that area in California that very strenuously objected to it.

Mr. MILLER of California. I appreciate that. The new water district has just been erected. It was voted for and erected by an overwhelming vote of that district, and they are just in the process

of getting organized, and this comes rather as a blow.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I want to compliment the gentleman for a very fine statement. I, as one member of the committee, will be very happy to hear from his representatives with reference to the matter that he has just discussed on the floor of the House. I am sure that all of the members of the committee will give very careful consideration to it when the matter is considered again. Again, I say, I want to compliment the gentleman on the fine statement he has made.

Mr. MILLER of California. I would like to say to the Committee that there most likely will be a supplemental appropriation bill coming in, and at that time, if they are ready for it, I hope to see this item brought before that committee when we will have an opportunity of laying it then formally before the committee.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, for several weeks the House Public Works Committee has been holding hearings on the controversial St. Lawrence waterway project to which I am unalterably opposed since it will serve no conceivable national good but to the contrary do irreparable damage to not only my district and State but to 85 percent of the Nation as a whole.

During the course of the hearings being conducted by the House Committee on Public Works, it has been rumored that the Army engineers have been roaming the hallways of Congress in a frantic effort to garner support for the already discredited St. Lawrence seaway project. It is said that they have gone so far that they are offering many Members of Congress from the Southern States a \$100,000,000 tidewater channel and from the mouth of the Mississippi to New Orleans. This project is known as the New Orleans-Gulf waterway, and is being used as bait in the desperate effort to drum up votes for the St. Lawrence seaway project.

Edgar Poe, who is a columnist for the New Orleans Times-Picayune stated in the edition of March 11, 1951 that President Truman did a little lobbying for the St. Lawrence project when he was visited recently by Guy Easterly who publishes the weekly Lafollette (Tenn.) Press.

According to publisher Easterly, when the interview was about over President Truman drew from a pile of papers on his desk another sheaf and began to talk of his program of waterways, which included a plan to dig a big ditch at New Orleans and bring that city within 45 miles of the ocean, at a cost of \$100,000,000.

In commenting on the visit of Mr. Easterly to the White House, columnist Poe said there apparently is no question that President Truman personally is interested in the proposed tidewater ship channel from New Orleans to the Gulf. He wants to see it built, but at the same time he wants New Orleans and the lower Mississippi Valley to go along with him on the controversial St. Lawrence seaway.

Continuing his comment, Mr. Poe said that if New Orleans and lower Mississippi shipping interests are not willing to do some trading President Truman "stands ready to hold their feet to the fire." In other words it would be a big trade, concluded Mr. Poe.

Mr. Chairman, this is ugly business. The President is trying to effect a trade that involves a \$100,000,000 nondefense waterway project at the mouth of the Mississippi River in return for support on a \$1,000,000,000 economic monstrosity known as the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that it is the business of the Army engineers to lobby or to bring pressure upon Members of Congress. Their job is to furnish Congress with information so that the elected Representatives of the American people can decide what is for the best interests of the American people as a whole.

Both of the above-named projects should not be considered at this time because of the necessity for conserving manpower, material, and money so badly needed in the defense effort.

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I hope we can make a little progress on this bill and move along. We have been very fair. With the indulgence of the other Members of the House, I hope that for the balance of the day there will be no more pro forma amendments, so that we can move on into the amendments that will be considered.

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman will yield, I hope we can do exactly as the gentleman from Washington has suggested. We have a lot of things to do. Let us get down to business.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, on page 14, line 20, I note the words "and treaties."

This reminds me that last April 18 was the sixth anniversary of the ratification by the Senate of the Mexican Water Treaty. Quite fittingly, on that anniversary date, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs tabled by a 2 to 1 vote the proposed central Arizona project. It took 6 years for the Mexican treaty chicken to grow up and come home to roost, but it finally did.

The Mexican Water Treaty gave Mexico a million acre-feet more than she had ever used before, and did this by giving Mexico free of charge the benefit of

storage in Hoover Dam which Congress had authorized on the promise that the water stored there would be used exclusively in the United States. Most of the water users in the Colorado River basin objected to it, but it was put through the Senate by Dean Acheson, the then Under Secretary of State. It was one more mistake of the tragic era in our foreign relations that produced the Yalta, Tehran, and Cairo agreements. The irony of the present situation is that this bad treaty was made possible only by the backing of the very same individuals who are now the promoters of the central Arizona project: Charles A. Carson, of Arizona, and Clifford H. Stone, of Colorado. They boosted the Treaty under the happy delusion that they were giving away California's water to Mexico. Mr. Acheson had been attorney for Arizona in the first Supreme Court suit—Two Hundred and Eighty-third United States Reports, page 423—to enjoin the construction of Hoover Dam and declare the Colorado River compact unconstitutional. The treaty rode through the Senate on the Acheson-Stone-Carson axis.

Now, 6 years later, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has ruled by a 2 to 1 vote that it will not consider the central Arizona project further until the water rights in the Colorado River have first been adjudicated by the Supreme Court, or agreed upon by the States. If this 1,000,000 acre-foot bonus had not been given to Mexico on the insistence of Mr. Carson, there might be water enough today for the central Arizona project.

The Mexican Water Treaty chicken, 6 years old, has come home to roost.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans; engineering and economic investigations, as a basis for legislation, and for reports thereon to Congress, relating to projects for the development and utilization of the water resources of Alaska; formulating plans and preparing designs and specifications for authorized Federal reclamation projects or parts thereof prior to appropriations for construction of such projects or parts; and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing projects; to remain available until expended, \$5,000,000, of which \$4,265,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and \$500,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River development fund: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any sums from this appropriation for investigations of any nature requested by States, municipalities, or other interests shall be upon the basis of the State, municipality, or other interest advancing at least 50 percent of the estimated cost of such investigations: *Provided further*, That, except as herein expressly provided with respect to investigations in Alaska, no part of this appropriation shall be expended in the conduct of activities which are not authorized by law.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: On page 15, line 10, after the word "expended," strike out "\$5,000,000, of which

\$4,265,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,000,000, of which \$3,500,000."

(Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to reduce the amount available for general investigations from \$5,000,000 to \$4,000,000. It is offered in the belief that in view of the over-all situation by which we are now confronted some of this work can well be deferred.

It is of course true, that the committee has already made a reduction of \$500,000 below the budget estimate and below the funds which were available for this purpose this year. But it is also true that the committee recommends an appropriation of \$5,000,000 for general investigations, which seems to me unduly liberal under present conditions.

If I read the hearings correctly, Mr. Chairman, there must be between two and three million dollars recommended under this item which refer not to any present programs, but to programs of the future.

For example, there is recommended in the neighborhood of a million dollars for advanced planning. There is also included, I think something like \$145,000 for reconnaissance, something like \$865,000 for basin surveys, and something like \$300,000 for general research.

These and other items account for between two and three million dollars.

Under general research I find that it is contemplated that the appropriation recommended shall be used to find solutions for various problems including studies of sediment transportation in streams, deposition in reservoirs, aggradation and degradation of stream beds above and below dams, reservoir evaporation studies, and studies of improved land use, soil management, and other similar studies.

Mr. Chairman, the items referred to, including these studies may be fully justified in normal times. They have their importance, but surely some of them can be deferred in view of present conditions.

The argument for deferment is emphasized by the fact that there appear to be between three and four billion dollars' worth of projects now available except for detailed plans and specifications as a backlog for subsequent completion.

This volume of projects will require a number of years for completion. Their completion date will, in all probability, be further in the future than now anticipated because of the great demand for steel and other materials, needed for national defense.

Mr. Wilson, Administrator of Defense Mobilization reports that demand for steel in the near future will be particularly heavy. Many projects, "even though helpful," he says, "must wait."

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the \$4,000,000,000 shelf of projects is an adequate shelf and that if we make \$4,000,000 available at this time instead of the proposed \$5,000,000 suggested by the committee, we shall be making ample provision for those investigations which are required at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which the gentleman from Massachusetts has offered would reduce this appropriation \$1,000,000. The committee has already cut it \$500,000 from the budget estimate. It is the part of the bill which calls for surveys and investigations of potential reclamation development. There is no use letting this country go to seed and stop everything that is good for America. The Nation is in a crisis. There is nobody on this floor who can deny that we are in a crisis, and I repeat, this country must go forward. They were asking for \$5,500,000 for investigations and surveys throughout the Nation. The committee cut that half a million dollars. But it takes money to make these surveys and investigations. When this crisis is over we must be in a position where the country can move forward again. That is why I ask that this amendment be defeated.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not true that the money from the reclamation fund is derived from funds received from the sale of land and resources in the western country? Is that not true?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is true.

Mr. ASPINALL. And also the \$500,000 which is referred to in this part of the bill comes from the Colorado River fund, coming from revenues of the Hoover Dam; is that not true?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Then, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] prevails, the United States of America has given the magnanimous sum of \$265,000 for the future development of that great area. Is that right?

Mr. KIRWAN. I think that is correct. I am not condemning anybody, but in 1929, when the collapse came in this country—please do not get me wrong or think that I am blaming any political party for the collapse—but when it did come only 29 out of every 100 families in the United States had electricity in their homes. That was due to the lack of surveys and investigations to find out what was wrong with America. Today there are still 25 out of every 100 families in the United States that have no electricity. We must find out the reason for that and do something about it.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. The \$500,000 in the Colorado fund is derived from the sale of power from the Hoover Dam?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes.

Mr. GRANGER. That is allocated to the Upper Basin States; is that not true?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, I believe so.

Mr. GRANGER. And what you are doing here is taking money that has been allocated by treaty and by agreement to the Upper Basin States and allocating that money to all the reclamation fund. Now, that is not fair.

Mr. KIRWAN. What we would be doing here with this amendment is stopping the progress of America. I do not care whether it is in California or Colorado or where it is, but anything you do that is injurious to one State hurts all the States. We have got to allow this Nation to go forward.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] is exactly right. The \$500,000 included here is not tax money. It is not money taken out of the pockets of the American taxpayers. It is a trust fund that has been set up by law. So, to cut it in the interest of economy and saving the taxpayer is a mistake as well as a blunder.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. It is with the greatest of reluctance that I oppose this amendment offered by my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], for whom I have such affection. I am sure that he is not knowingly and deliberately seeking to do anything here today which would interfere with the development of reclamation in the West. I know he is sincere in the amendment which he offers. However, I feel constrained to oppose the amendment, and I hope the committee will reject it. I think the subcommittee on the Interior Department appropriations has done a splendid job this year. I wish to commend the committee on the bill that is now before us.

This is always a controversial bill; this is a bill which involves appropriations for the West, and there are many Members of this body who are not familiar with the problems of Western States, and the necessity for the many different items appearing in this bill. For this reason there is always opposition to certain provisions of this annual Interior appropriation bill.

The committee has already reduced the amount for investigation by \$500,000. I do not know what prompted the committee to make that reduction. I am advised that the Bureau of Reclamation will need the full amount of \$5,500,000 if it is to continue the investigation work which is now in progress and which I think is absolutely essential. Some of these projects on which the Bureau is now working are important, not alone to the development of the West, but also to our defense effort. The preliminary investigation work on a project, when once started, should be carried on to its conclusion.

We in the West, and particularly in Colorado, at this moment are very much

interested in this item for investigation work by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau has been doing a large amount of investigation work in Colorado, a good deal in my district, and considerable in the Fourth Congressional District so ably represented by my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]. This work has not been completed. Therefore this is an item in which we have a very keen personal interest.

It is obvious that the work of the Bureau will be seriously curtailed if this appropriation is reduced. I fear such a reduction would have a direct effect upon these investigations which are now under way in Colorado.

One of the projects on which the Bureau has been working upon is known as the Frying Pan-Arkansas project, which involves the transmountain diversion of water. This water will be used for domestic purposes, as well as irrigation. Cities and towns are now short of domestic water, and every effort is being made to expedite action on this project. Every Member of this House realizes the importance of water to the development of the West. We have had two or three rather dry years in certain parts of the West; it is, therefore, all the more important that we appropriate sufficient funds so that the necessary investigation work on these reclamation projects can be continued. This is an item that should not be reduced.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The observation which the gentleman made applies, I think, as well to the East as to the agricultural and arid sections of our country. We remember the experience New York City had only in recent months. The water is vitally important in the life of all of us, and in connection with the activities of the many sections of our country.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. No, one, of course, would willingly do anything that would interfere with the proper development of the great West.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I am sure the gentleman is correct. He has served on the Appropriations Committee for many years and has been a friend of the West. I consider him one of the most valuable members of that great committee.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman for his observation in that connection. I point out to the gentleman that according to the hearings we have on the shelf some \$4,000,000,000 worth of projects ready for subsequent construction and that the recommendation of the committee includes over a million dollars for advance planning work. It seems to me that is an excessive recommendation in the light of the situation which confronts us at this time.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I will state to the gentleman that I am not familiar with the details as to just how this money will be spent. The sum of \$5,000,000 has been recommended. The Bureau had \$5,500,000 this year, and I believe the same amount should be given them for the next fiscal year.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to my distinguished friend from California.

Mr. ENGLE. The backlog of authorized projects on the shelf are not investigated. That is what this fund is for, to continue the planning and investigation of those projects which are on the shelf just like the ones in the upper basin which are now under consideration. Merely to have the projects on the shelf does not do the engineering and does not do the planning.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I would just like to add my support to my colleague from Colorado. One thing this House can do that I think will do more harm than anything else is to make up our minds not to investigate these projects thoroughly and completely for whatever length of time may be necessary to know what will happen when the projects are built.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I agree with my distinguished colleague. I hope this amendment will be voted down and the appropriation left at \$5,000,000. I would personally like to see the same amount provided as spent this year, or \$5,500,000. However, I am willing to go along with the committee on its recommendation. I feel it would be disastrous if there should be any further reduction made, as contained in this amendment. I therefore urge that the amendment be defeated.

(Mr. CHENOWETH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, on page 14, line 23, appear the words, "for engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects."

I am advised that the Reclamation Bureau has already spent approximately \$1,500,000 on so-called engineering and economic investigations of the proposed central Arizona project. This is the project which the Secretary of the Interior has reported would cost the taxpayers of the United States \$2,075,000,000 in interest alone. The taxpayers of Arizona would pay three-eighths of 1 percent of that, and the taxpayers of the other States would pay 99 3/4 percent. The share of the taxpayers of California would be over \$172,000,000; the taxpayers of New York would have to pay \$304,000,000; those of Pennsylvania \$158,000,000; those of Ohio \$119,000,000; those of Texas \$90,000,000; those of Illinois \$157,000,000 and so on. Since that time the Secretary of the Interior has increased the cost estimates 11 percent.

This is the same project which the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on April 18 ordered tabled

until the water rights in the lower Colorado River are first determined by agreement or by adjudication of the Supreme Court.

I note that at page 15, line 20, appears the language:

No part of this appropriation shall be expended in the conduct of activities which are not authorized by law.

The central Arizona project is not authorized by law.

I want some assurance that this \$1,500,000 already spent on investigations of the fantastic central Arizona project is the last money that will be poured down this rat hole. Otherwise, I shall insist that proof be offered of the legislative authority for engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects, and, unless satisfied on the point, will make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH) there were—ayes 78, noes 52.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects or parts thereof (including power transmission facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, \$207,190,000, of which \$29,202,200 shall be derived from the reclamation fund.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 16, line 2, strike out "\$207,190,000" and insert "\$197,000,000 and the cut below the budget estimate shall be deducted from the estimates for power and transmission lines."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I think there will be demand for more than 10 minutes to speak on this amendment. This is one of the most important amendments to the bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 223. Joint resolution to give the Department of Commerce the authority to extend certain charters of vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 271) entitled "An act to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOEY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EMERGENCY FOOD RELIEF ASSISTANCE TO INDIA

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 209, Rept. No. 381), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3791) to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 6 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

VETERANS' HOSPITAL FOR NEGROES

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 210, Rept. No. 382), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 314) to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

VERMONT AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes, with a House amendment

thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman for Iowa? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COOLEY, HOPE, POAGE, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, and GRANT.

HOUSE OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MICHIGAN COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will provide for the issuance of a commemorative stamp commemorating the beginning of the modern history of Michigan. I have also personally brought this matter to the attention of the Postmaster General, who may authorize the issuance of such stamps, and I am enlisting the support of the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, on which I serve, to intercede with the Postmaster General or to obtain action on this bill.

The beginning of the history of Michigan and the surrounding States is marked by the landing of Antoine de la Mothe Cadillac at the place where Detroit now stands.

The establishment of a fortified community in the Indian dominated wilderness has had such a far-reaching effect on the development of the country and on the security and safety of the world that it is fitting such a commemorative stamp be issued.

Detroit, the "Arsenal of Democracy," had its beginning in this landing back in 1701. Today it is one of the Nation's and the world's largest metropolises and the center of the automobile industry and many other industries and businesses. Its people have the know-how for the production of the arms and sinews of our great national defense program.

I would like to insert in the RECORD a statement which appears in the book entitled "Michigan: A Guide to the Wolverine State" by the Oxford University Press. This statement, entitled "Cadillac and the Settlement of Detroit," points out the significance of this small beginning to the historical events which have followed:

CADILLAC AND THE SETTLEMENT OF DETROIT

In 1694, Antoine de la Mothe Cadillac was appointed commandant of the Michilimackinac post, which had become the most important trading center in the whole Northwest. From his point of vantage, Cadillac perceived that different methods were necessary to hasten development of the country and to circumvent the English, whose agents, seeking control of the Michigan area, constantly incited Indians to rise against the French and made illicit bargains with unscrupulous fur traders, to the detriment of the monopolists. Cadillac went to France in 1699 and obtained authorization to establish a fortified settlement at the "place du detroit"—the place of the strait. On July 24,

1701, he and a party of more than 100 reached the wooded shores of the strait where Detroit now stands; on that day the history of Michigan's development actually began.

The fortified community established by Cadillac and his men was named Fort Pontchartrain, in honor of the minister of marine. Six thousand Indians of various tribes set up villages in the vicinity of the fort, which within a year attained major importance as a trading post. Notwithstanding its prosperity, the administrative expenses, borne by the government of the mother country, were so heavy that on several occasions there was talk of abandoning the settlement.

Cadillac had been promised full authority in this region, but on October 31, 1701, the Company of the Colony of Canada was granted the exclusive right to trade at Detroit. The following year the fur trade was wrested from Cadillac. The dispute that arose was settled in 1706, when Cadillac was given control of the trade of the strait, and the company was accorded similar privileges in the remainder of the Michigan peninsula.

Hampered by the rigid control exercised by the ministers at Versailles, Cadillac's position was made still more difficult by the hostility of the missionaries. Sale of liquor to the Indians was a source of endless friction between the church and colonial officers. Charges were brought against Cadillac in 1704, and he was detained many months at Quebec before being exonerated. In 1710, he was removed, "by promotion," to the governorship of Louisiana, where he carried out some of the plans he had contemplated for Fort Pontchartrain.

After his departure, Fort Pontchartrain, or Detroit, as the settlement was beginning to be called, underwent 20 years of mismanagement at the hands of inefficient and sometimes venal commandants. Trade declined, a large number of settlers left, and one commandant foolishly reduced the fort to about half its original size, leaving many outlying householders exposed to British-inspired Indian raids that began in 1712.

No serious attempt was made to reorganize administration of the settlement until 1729, when Robert Navarre, superintendent, was appointed to discharge certain limited notarial duties. This first instance of the exercise of civil jurisdiction within the borders of Michigan, reflecting a new policy on the part of the absentee rulers, proved a welcome diversion from military absolutism.

Though there were frequent alarms and occasional raids by Indians, the population of Detroit increased steadily. Many of those who arrived during the 1730's and 1740's settled outside the town. They were loath to go far inland, and, since the lands directly east of the community were already taken by the French settlers (see Detroit), while those to the west were set aside for friendly natives, many of the newcomers crossed the strait to farm the rich lands opposite Detroit. About 650 inhabitants, including 100 soldiers, lived in Detroit proper in 1750.

Growth of the strait community and the expansion of the farm lands in its immediate vicinity were checked by the outbreak of the French and Indian War in 1754. Although Michigan was somewhat removed from the fighting zone, many of its inhabitants took part in campaigns in Ohio and western Pennsylvania. The war ended in 1760 with the French surrender to the English at Montreal. Martial law prevailed throughout the territory until ratification of the Treaty of Paris in 1763.

Maj. Robert Rogers, leader of a band of rangers who had served the British as scouts, raiders, and envoys in Indian affairs, was sent out to receive the surrender of Detroit. He entered the town November 29, 1760, after

Co. and the said Charles E. Nelson and Irwin I. Main, but such refund could not be made because such amounts had been covered into the Treasury: *Provided*, That no part of either of the sums appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claims settled by the payment of such sums, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ALBERT W. LACK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3229) for the relief of Mrs. Albert W. Lack.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill and subsequent bills on the Private Calendar Nos. 209 to 220, inclusive, be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names.

[Roll No. 37]

Barrett	Gamble	Murray, Wis.
Bates, Mass.	Gillette	Nelson
Bolling	Goodwin	O'Neill
Bramblett	Gore	Powell
Breen	Granahan	Prouty
Brehm	Green	Rains
Brooks	Gwinn	Redden
Burdick	Hale	Rivers
Byrne, N. Y.	Harden	Rogers, Fla.
Canfield	Harvey	Sabath
Case	Hinshaw	Secrest
Chatham	Holifield	Sheehan
Chudoff	Irving	Shelley
Colmer	Kee	Sieminski
Corbett	Kelley, Pa.	Simpson, Pa.
Coudert	Kennedy	Sittler
Curtis, Mo.	Kersten, Wis.	Staggers
Dawson	Klein	Stockman
Denny	Lind	Taylor
Dingell	Machrowicz	Walter
Donohue	Miller, N. Y.	Watts
Eberharter	Morgan	Whitaker
Elliot	Morrison	Widnall
Evins	Murphy	Woodruff
Fulton	Murray, Tenn.	Yorty

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 354 Members have answered to their names; a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department

of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3790, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Wednesday, April 25, 1951, there was pending the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

There being no objection, the Clerk again reported the amendment, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 16, line 2, strike out "\$207,190,000" and insert "\$197,000,000 and the cut below the budget estimate shall be deducted from the estimates for power and transmission lines."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is for that Indian amendment. I have no objection to its being taken up ahead of my statement, but I do not want it taken out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. It will not be taken out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 13, line 9, for the purpose of offering an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON of Washington: Page 13, line 9, after "appropriated" strike out "\$2,080,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,109,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the United States is in a very critical situation. Everywhere people are anxious to have large developments in their own territory. Some people in my territory are anxious to do that sort of thing. Frankly, I do not blame them for wanting to have those things, but I do feel that everywhere throughout the land we must realize that we are in a war; we must realize that the United States is at the crossroads; that it cannot continue to have high spending for domestic purposes and at the same time meet the responsibilities that are ours from a military standpoint. Frankly, I do not like the present military situation; I am very much disturbed about it, and I feel that we have got to put every whit of strength and effort into it that we can. I feel that

we have got to take cuts in such items as these and that those cuts should be apportioned against the projects that are farthest away from completion and that will yield the least. I think it is perfectly ridiculous in such times as these to start a power project or a reclamation project that cannot be completed within 4 or 5 years. I think that unless the people of the United States generally come to realize that they have got to do without things that they are used to having and get along with less for themselves, be less selfish but more public-spirited, and have more of an appreciation of the serious international situation we are in, that it is going to be exceedingly difficult for the United States to surmount the situation that she is in. I was told the other day by the chairman of the subcommittee, who is present, that he appreciated the tremendous difficulties we are in; that he saw in his own home town, as you and I see in ours, an enormous number of people buying expensive things and borrowing money for that purpose. Let us not be borrowing money for such purposes on behalf of the United States Government. Let us economize and try to cut down every dollar we can everywhere in Government operations so that we may meet our defense obligations. That is what I ask the Members of the Congress to do here. The committee itself has made cuts totaling \$16,000,000 in the estimates that were originally sent up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, these cuts, as I stated, were made to the extent of \$16,000,000, but I believe that a further cut of \$10,000,000 may be made without hurting them a bit. For my own part, I believe they can take off more. A cut of \$10,000,000 would be a little less than 5 percent of the total amount the committee has reported. There are projects galore in this situation that can take cuts, as a matter of fact, so that the \$10,000,000 could easily be made up. Some of the projects involving large amounts have been cut by the committee only a very small figure. There will be, they tell us, no new projects started. On the other hand, there are a large number of items that are still in the bill, some of which have been cut only a very, very few dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the committee to adopt this amendment and I am going to ask those folks from the reclamation territory to meet the situation as I am going to ask the people in my territory to meet the demands they might make for flood control, for rivers and harbors, and for other things that are not absolutely essential at this time and which can wait for a little while longer. The only way we can possibly work out of this situation is to be willing to make sacrifices ourselves. These projects requiring 10, 12, 20, and 30 mil-

lion dollars can easily take a 10-percent cut without the slightest bit of harm. The small delay in volume of land coming into irrigation 3 or 4 years hence is not a matter of real seriousness as compared with the desirability of saving every dollar we can save so that we can carry on our national defense.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand the gentleman, he is asking that the \$207,000,000 item be cut by \$10,000,000, which is only 5 percent; is that not correct?

Mr. TABER. That is true, it is only 5 percent. What I meant was that the whole cut, including the committee cut from the budget estimate, 16 plus 10 million, is only a little bit over 10 percent.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As to this item we are cutting now, it amounts to only 5 percent.

Mr. TABER. Only 5 percent up to now. I think the committee ought to very quickly and very readily and without the slightest division march in and make this cut. I hope that it can be done. I hope that the House will be nearly unanimous in making the cut.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York would take from this bill, as he said, \$10,000,000. Then on top of it he wants to put in language to take an equivalent of \$26,000,000 out of this particular bill. Now, the committee took \$16,000,000 out of it, below the budget estimate, and they gave it a good going over. I was admiring the gentleman from New York when he said that he liked the people in Auburn and he would like to back up the people in Auburn. I do not like to say this to be humorous, but I know his part of the country pretty well, there is not very much need for power. And, the same is true about Youngstown, Ohio. I am not discriminating against Auburn, N. Y., and there are no minerals in Youngstown, Ohio. But in the 12 States and one Territory where the Government today, as I told you, is going to spend \$66,000,000,000 on national defense, it is necessary that we have power. We passed a bill here last week calling for the expenditure of \$6,000,000,000 more for defense. Just stop and think of an expenditure of \$66,000,000,000, and we want to cut the heart out of what the Government is going to spend most of the money on, which is minerals and resources. Did you ever hear of anything so foolish? I remember that during the last war we came in with the same cry; that we must stop spending to save money for the Government, and while we stopped projects that should have been completed, every project today is costing twice as much money as it would have cost then had they been completed. We are spending twice as much money today than what the original project was estimated at just because in the Second World War we stopped preparing America. And you are going to do the same thing again. You did not learn any lesson. There is

no new project in this bill, not one. Most of the projects are over half or nearly three-quarters completed, and now we are going to let them lay there, and after everything gets higher and higher we will begin to finish them at a great additional cost. Yet, some people call that saving money. I repeat, we are spending \$66,000,000,000 to carry on this defense program, and the thing they are hollering about is protecting our resources, making research, and most essential of all, creating more power. I made a statement on the floor of this House 2 years ago that the Interior bill should be placed at \$2,000,000,000 and not \$700,000,000, which was the figures at that time, to take care of a country that we have been robbing and looting for 200 years. I asked the Secretary of the Interior when he appeared before our committee, how many certificates of necessity he was going to sign, and he said \$1,600,000,000 worth. And I said, "How many are on your desk now?" He said something like \$400,000,000. Well, that took it up to the figures I cited 2 years ago, and he said I was absolutely right.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I think the gentleman spoke about power. Now, why could we not let this power thing rest until this war is over and appropriate money for our national defense instead?

Mr. KIRWAN. I just said that the most essential thing in the whole program is power. We cannot begin to get enough of it. We are going to spend \$66,000,000,000 on this program, and it will be scattered over those 12 States. We could let the power rest if it was for Auburn, N. Y., and Youngstown, Ohio. We could probably cut out half of the power. But when research is going to take up a big part of this \$66,000,000,000, and when they have to put up plants, this power is necessary. Otherwise, you are going to waste billions of dollars.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Further, the projects about which the gentleman is talking could never have been developed by private enterprise. We have to have the Government develop them. Those that I know about are over 80 percent complete, and we want to get enough to complete them.

Mr. NICHOLSON. If the gentleman will yield further, may I say to the gentleman from California that private enterprise has accomplished all these things. We never had to have the Government in anything.

Mr. KIRWAN. The Government had to get into power production or you would never have won the Second World War. Where would you have got the power to develop and produce the aluminum for the airplanes?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I was rather interested in the question propounded by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. Even former President Herbert Hoover recognized that private enterprise could not build these huge power projects. I have a recollection that the largest dam built in America prior to the construction of Grand Coulee is now called Hoover Dam. If the gentleman is at variance with Mr. Hoover, I would be delighted to hear from him. It is quite obvious that there is nothing new about the program. It was Teddy Roosevelt who started many of these great power projects. The first preference provision ever written into law for the sale of public power was during the regime of Teddy Roosevelt in 1906.

Mr. KIRWAN. The law will not allow private utilities to build on streams and rivers any more. The only one that can build there is the Government. Billions of kilowatts are going to waste, and the only one that can develop them is the Government. Every kilowatt is needed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman tell us what States will be affected by this amendment?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; I will be happy to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Put them in the Record, so we will know what they are.

Mr. KIRWAN. Alaska, Arizona, Nevada, California, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, Texas, North Dakota, South Dakota, Washington, and Wyoming.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. There are two parts to the Taber amendment, as I view it. One is a \$10,000,000 reduction in the amount specified in the bill. The other is a \$16,000,000 deduction on account of the power lines, to eliminate them, which the second part of the amendment carries. Which of those is the harder blow to the war effort?

Mr. KIRWAN. They are both knock-out blows. Neither one of them should be in here. Again I say, if we are going to spend \$66,000,000,000 to try to win in the present emergency, the most essential thing is power, and here you want to curb it. I do not think Stalin could do the job of sabotaging this bill that this Congress is doing. I toss out that as a challenge.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. There is no one in this House more opposed to the Government competing with private enterprise in the sale of electricity or any other

commodity than I, but all of us realize that the Government is supposed to build multiple-purpose projects and hydro-electric power dams, and that private enterprise cannot build them on our public waterways. I shall support any measure to further Government efforts to produce power upon our public waters—the power to be distributed to the consuming public by locally owned and controlled public distributing agencies and private enterprise.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Arkansas, who has been prating here about the TVA for a long time, that TVA does not retail the power, it transmits it and sells it to the cities and municipalities, and they distribute it.

Let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, your people are being overcharged \$93,000,000 a year for your electricity and if you are ever going to get any relief, you are going to have to get it through public power lines.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I am sorry I cannot yield to the gentleman. I yielded practically 2 minutes out of the 5 minutes that I have, and I would like to complete my statement.

Mr. Chairman, I again ask the committee to please not adopt this amendment. I know that every Member in the House is interested in America, and interested in winning this war. But this committee that listens to the evidence and the testimony for 6 weeks, surely they have an idea of what it is all about, and when the Budget cut it so much and we cut it \$16,000,000 below the Budget, we cut every dollar out of this program that it can stand to be cut. I ask you now, with all the sincerity that I can muster, do not attempt to cut another bit out of this portion of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LOVRE to the amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Strike out that portion of the Taber amendment which reads "and the cut below the budget estimate shall be deducted from the estimates for power and transmission lines."

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Chairman, I have the utmost respect and admiration for my colleague, the gentleman from New York. Certainly he is to be commended for trying to cut expenses at every turn of the road. If there ever was a time for economy in Government, it is now. If there ever was a time to go on a pay-as-you-go basis, it is now. But on the other hand we must be rational in our approach. If we are just going to hack and slash at random without giving thought to the consequences, we are going to find ourselves in hot water. I have no quarrel with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in trying to

save every penny possible. I am with him 100 percent and you will always find me in his corner, but I cannot go along when the cut is in the nature of a penalty and at the expense of the American taxpayer. That is exactly what is wrong with the Taber amendment. I am voicing no objection to the attempt at saving dollars and cents, but I am objection to the form of application.

The Taber amendment reads:

On page 16, line 2, strike out "\$207,190,000" and insert "\$197,000,000" and the cut below the budget estimate shall be deducted for the estimates for power and transmission lines.

Let us look at the facts. The budget request for the Bureau of Reclamation for construction and rehabilitation totaled \$223,690,000. The committee cut approximately 7 percent of this amount, bringing the figure down to \$207,190,000, which is the amount you will find in the bill. This amount includes \$24,740,152 for transmission lines, which represents a committee cut of 23 percent from the budget estimate. If the Taber amendment applies only to this part of the program, you have an approximate cut of 83 percent, leaving a balance of \$5,689,608. This drastic cut would scuttle the transmission projects now under contract and actual construction in about a dozen States. This, I say, is penny-wise and pound foolish.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOVRE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. It will unbalance the entire construction program and plan of the Department, will it not?

Mr. LOVRE. You are definitely right.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOVRE. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to congratulate the gentleman in pointing out that the worst feature of the Taber amendment is that it would strike out these transmission lines. I oppose the entire amendment.

Mr. LOVRE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOVRE. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. Is this cut in reclamation or is it a further cut in transmission and power lines?

Mr. LOVRE. This is a cut in power and transmission lines under the Taber amendment.

Mr. HORAN. Does the gentleman consider it tenable?

Mr. LOVRE. No.

Mr. HORAN. Then it goes to the Senate and we have the same procedure that we have had heretofore.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LOVRE. I yield.

Mr. COX. I would like very much if the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] could see his way clear to accept the gentleman's amendment. The acceptance of the amendment would, in my judgment, make certain the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. It would amount to the same thing. It would amount to a saving of \$10,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment to my amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the committee is not accepting the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOVRE. I yield.

Mr. WERDEL. What is the difference between the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York and the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. LOVRE. The cut will be spread across the board and not single out any particular project like power and transmission lines.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOVRE. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the gentleman's amendment to the amendment is worth while. Personally, I intend to support it.

Mr. LOVRE. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOVRE. On the other hand, if the Taber amendment applies to all power plants and transmission lines, you have approximately the same result. The amount of \$207,190,000 which the committee provided for the Bureau includes \$64,059,458 for power plants and transmission lines which represents a 13-percent cut from the budget estimate. If the Taber amendment applies to this part of the program, you have an approximate cut of 36 percent, leaving a balance of \$46,913,504. This, too, will scuttle the power plants and transmission lines now under contract and actual construction in about a dozen States. Again, I say, this is penny-wise and pound-foolish.

My amendment leaves the cut at the same figure as the gentleman from New York proposes which is \$10,190,000 over and above the committee cut of \$16,500,000 but spreads the cut over the entire construction and rehabilitation program of the Bureau of Reclamation instead of applying it solely to transmission lines and power plants or transmission lines whichever is the correct interpretation of the Taber amendment. What could be fairer? If this amendment is adopted, we will then have an approximate cut of 11 percent right across the board for the construction and rehabilitation program under the Bureau of Reclamation.

Before we scuttle these projects by adopting the Taber amendment, remember that each and every one are compatible with and a part of the national defense program and must be viewed in that light. Remember, too, if we want more production from our farms and more farm manpower for the armed services, we must give the remaining farmers the necessary power to carry on.

Remember, too, that most of these projects are already under contract and construction at a tremendous cost. Do we want to lose what we have already invested and possible litigation for breach of contract under guise of economy?

I sincerely hope you will support this amendment which cuts the same amount as the Taber amendment—the only difference being that it spreads the cut over the entire program without scuttling the many essential projects now under construction in approximately a dozen States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has again expired.

(Mr. LOVRE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, our committee, in my opinion, did a conscientious job in reducing the appropriation of the Bureau of Reclamation from \$223,690,000 to \$207,190,000. We have tried to make real economies in this bill.

As I indicated the other day, we have made a larger cut than any other subcommittee that has brought an appropriation bill to the floor during the present session of the Congress. There are certain items that can be cut, and we have tried to do that, but anyone who is familiar with the necessity for building up the industrial resources of America certainly is aware of the fact that we need more power.

I do not know of anything more ridiculous than to try to cut out the power and generation facilities in the United States at a time when we should get every bit of power we can get in order to extend the industrial capacity of America. It is the industrial capacity of America which is the source of our strength; it is not a case of just having a few soldiers and getting them in uniform; it is our ability to produce materials and weapons of war when the time comes. It is very short-sighted policy to cut out the very weapons that we need in order to make this country strong.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. Were the cuts the committee made based on cutting out those projects that have not yet been started?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. A substantial part—and this is the interesting part of it—a substantial part of the cuts made by the Committee stem from the fact that the Government was able to enter into wheeling contracts with private utilities, thereby avoiding the necessity of building these lines. The point is that these lines must be built; we must put generators into the dams in order to get power. Not only that, but my good friend knows that in

the Pacific Northwest the faster we get our generating facilities into operation the sooner the Government will get its revenue out of those projects to pay back the cost of the investment. This is just good common business sense.

Mr. HORAN. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman mentioned four or five States, including the State of Washington, as States against which this reduction of reclamation funds will fall heavily. Is that because we have under way out there the great Columbia Basin project which would be affected by these funds?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is correct. Not only that, but to show how absurd this amendment is, we are in the process, as the gentleman knows, of putting in the last three generators at Grand Coulee Dam. As offered by the gentleman from New York the amendment would apply to both power and transmission facilities and, of course, it would mean a curtailment of that program. It is absolutely essential that we speed up the power program rather than curtail it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Massachusetts have an opportunity to speak on this matter?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts in due course.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. I will ask the gentleman if it is not true that when these generating facilities are put in, unless we have completed at that time the transmission lines our investment will lie idle and we will not be able to use the power that we could develop?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is right; it would be a waste of our resources. It is in the public interest to get the generating facilities into operation so that they can sell power to both private and public utilities, and to do that we must build the transmission lines.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Also let me say to the gentleman from Oregon that the money that we spent in building the Grand Coulee Dam will in a measure be wasted if we adopt this policy of forbidding the building of these lines to carry this power to make it available for use.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for a very brief question; it is true, is it not as the gentleman well knows, that when Bonne-

ville was constructed we had this same fight and the transmission facilities were not put in and there was a long period of time that we could not use the power.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is right. There is nothing new about what the committee is trying to do.

Let us remember a few fundamental things. The Reclamation Act was passed in 1902, and it was amended in 1906 during the regime of Teddy Roosevelt. In that particular amendment provision was made for the granting of preference in the sale of surplus power from reclamation projects to public bodies and municipalities. In order to carry out that philosophy laid down by the Congress in 1906 it is essential and necessary for the Congress of the United States to build transmission lines from the Government-owned dams to the preferred customers if the private power companies will not build those transmission lines and wheel the power at a fair and reasonable rate.

What has happened here? The committee went through this bill meticulously and in each and every instance where a fair and decent contract could be entered into between the private utilities and the Government at a fair and reasonable rate the committee deleted those lines. What is left in the bill represents funds for transmission lines in those instances where we cannot get the power to preferred customers in any other way. That is the story in a nutshell. I defy anyone on the floor of the House now to say that it is otherwise. There is nothing new about it. The preference act has been amended from time to time and the law adopted in 1906 has been extended to the Department of the Interior to apply to the Southeastern Power, to the Southwestern Power, to the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Bonneville power project. It is a basic part of the Flood Control Act of 1944 adopted by the Congress in that year and contained in section 4 of the law.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, this is carrying out to a great extent the organic law of 1902, as amended by the 1906 act, passed during a Republican administration, is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. It was not socialistic then, but when we Democrats try to carry out their program, then they hurl the charge of socialism at us.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The charges leveled against these public-power projects are ridiculous, because public-power projects, the construction of these great dams—yes, Hoover Dam; Boulder Dam, as it was known before—all built by the Government—have made possible new private enterprise on an unprecedented scale in America, and it has been the very foundation for our strength. It has made it possible for us during World War II to expand the economy of America to meet unprece-

dented war needs. As I have repeated on previous occasions, it is a curious fact that the Government had to look to the Tennessee Valley and to the Columbia River Valley to build its greatest industrial enterprises, for the defense of America. I refer to the great Oak Ridge plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and the Atomic Energy Commission plant at Hanford, Wash.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is a double-barreled thrust at the Reclamation power and irrigation program. It would neatly and completely sabotage the agreements just made by the Government with the power companies for transmission of Government power.

The language of the amendment purports to reduce the appropriation for construction and rehabilitation in the Bureau of Reclamation section of the bill by \$10,190,000. As a matter of fact, the language of the amendment directs that the cut below the budget estimate, which was \$223,690,000, shall be deducted from the estimates for power and transmission lines.

Therefore, the actual reduction proposed in the amendment would be from \$223,690,000 to \$197,000,000, or a total reduction in appropriations for power and transmission lines of \$26,690,000.

This reduction is the most drastic yet proposed to enable the private power utilities to thwart the public power program of reclamation so essential to the irrigation and other resource development of the West. Without power-generating facilities and transmission lines, great multiple-purpose projects like the Columbia Basin in Washington, the Central Valley in California, the Colorado-Big Thompson in Colorado, and the Missouri River Basin project in Montana, North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Wyoming, and Kansas would not be feasible.

Should the Congress finally approve such drastic reductions, further construction of the irrigation features of these great multiple-purpose projects would be infeasible.

Public power revenues give substantial financial aid to irrigation in each one of the 17 Western States. That is something the private power companies in its grasping drive to kill public power has not done and will not do. The private utilities are out to make money and in many instances does not even give lip service to the vital irrigation developments that are required to give food, feed, and forage in carrying on the defense program to care for the rapidly increasing population in the Western States. California, Oregon, and Washington showed the greatest increases in population from 1940 to 1950 of any section of the country. These people must be fed and the transportation facilities across the continent must not be swamped by moving food supplies westward when railroad transportation is required for moving war material.

The amendment is even more drastic than any yet proposed in the drive to throttle the public power program as recommended in the Interior Depart-

ment appropriation bill for fiscal year 1952. Heretofore the private utilities have asserted that it supports the generation of power at reclamation and army dams. Under this amendment, however, construction of power facilities at many reclamation dams would be seriously delayed or stopped altogether, right at the time the energy is needed by farmers, defense plants, and the cities and towns of our Western States.

Here is what would happen in some of the Western States were the Taber amendment to be adopted.

In Arizona and Nevada, the installation of the power plant at Davis Dam and transmission lines to vital defense centers in Arizona would be halted or materially slowed down.

In California the vital Folsom Dam power plant on the American River would be slowed down, if not halted altogether. California, like the other Pacific Coast States, is confronted by a power shortage. Our committee eliminated three controversial transmission lines from the bill and retained three others that will serve the Folsom Dam power plant and important defense installations in the San Francisco Bay area. More than two-thirds of the cost of the Central Valley project whose irrigation facilities are advancing the great agricultural production in the San Joaquin Valley will be repaid from power revenues produced at Shasta and Keswick Dams, now in operation, and at Folsom Dam when it is completed.

On page 1341 of the hearings on the Interior bill before the Subcommittee on Appropriations, there appears a telegram to the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee from Hon. Earl Warren, Governor of California. Governor Warren made a request for appropriations of \$44,450,000. He supported every one of the items, including the transmission lines and power plant at Folsom Dam, that the Budget Bureau had recommended. He even urged appropriations for the Delta steam electric plant which was not included in the budget estimate. From the Governor's telegram, it is fair to assume that officially the State of California is supporting the recommendations in the bill before the House and would oppose the crippling Taber amendment.

In Colorado, we are completing the great Colorado-Big Thompson project, primarily a mammoth irrigation development to aid food production in northeastern Colorado. The power plants and transmission lines now being installed would be slowed down, if not halted altogether, by this proposed cut in reclamation funds.

The State of Idaho is becoming power conscious. Adoption of this amendment would be notice to Idaho that the House of Representatives looks with disfavor on public power developments in that State. Construction of Palisades Dam would be pushed back even further by such a declaration.

In Montana, the committee eliminated transmission lines it considered not necessary at this time. However, should the Taber amendment be adopted, vital

power production at Hungry Horse and transmission lines that serve the Missouri River basin project in eastern Montana and North Dakota would be crippled.

Nebraska, a great public power State, requires the completion of transmission facilities to bring public power from reclamation projects in Colorado and Wyoming and from Fort Randall Dam, being constructed by the Corps of Engineers on the Missouri River. The amount in Nebraska affected by the Taber amendment is relatively small but the funds required are vital to completion of the system for transmitting public power into Nebraska.

New Mexico and Texas are concerned with extensions of the power system of the Rio Grande reclamation project. This system serves vital defense needs, including agricultural areas.

North and South Dakota have perhaps the most important stake in the transmission systems provided for in the budget estimates and in the Interior bill before the House. Work on the transmission lines in these two States is well under way and the drastic cut in funds proposed by the Taber amendment would seriously delay getting public power to preference customers in these two States.

While there are no funds in the bill for extension of public power systems to the great State of Minnesota, there are now pending supplemental estimates that would extend the Missouri River Basin project system to Minnesota. Hampering the public power and transmission system by slashing appropriations will demolish the hopes of Minnesota to get the advantages of public power.

In my home State of Washington we are just completing the greatest hydroelectric power plant in the world. To make this plant fully workable for the great defense industries and increasing population of the Pacific Northwest, the funds provided in the bill are the minimum necessary to expedite the completion of the Grand Coulee power plant of the Columbia Basin project. To cut these minimum requirements would be a blow to public power in the Pacific Northwest, including the Bonneville system that serves Oregon as well as Washington, and would also be a blow to the irrigation development of the Columbia Basin project which is largely financed by surplus power revenues produced at Grand Coulee Dam.

Oregon has no direct appropriation for reclamation power but is vitally concerned because of the dependence of its industrial centers of Portland and elsewhere on Grand Coulee Dam power delivered through the Bonneville system.

Wyoming has seen the first power plant of the Missouri River Basin project at Kortes Dam put into operation, Boysen Dam and power plant in the northern part of Wyoming is nearing completion, and the completion of transmission systems to carry this power to the ranches and industries of Wyoming cannot be delayed without serious disruption of food production, principally through livestock, and to industrial oil production for vital defense purposes.

The effect of this amendment, if approved, would be to completely nullify the work that has been done to get public power to preference customers by using facilities of the private-power companies. In just the last few weeks Pacific Gas & Electric Co., the biggest single utility in the United States, signed a contract with the Interior Department agreeing to transmit reclamation power in California over its own lines to the customers who have preference under the law.

And what did this committee do? It took out of the bill the money that Interior had asked for lines paralleling the company lines. We did the same thing in Montana, where an agreement had been reached with the Montana Power Co. in the last few months taking the money for duplicating lines out of the estimates. Now if the power crowd is not going to play fair and respect these agreements and insists on coming in through the back door with a murderous amendment such as this, then I think instead of reducing Reclamation's appropriation we should increase it so that it can build the lines and operate independently of the power companies. This amendment can only mean that they are not to be trusted, and they do not respect the assurances given this committee during the course of its hearings.

If this amendment is accepted, Interior would be perfectly justified in assuming that the wheeling agreements just executed are mere scraps of paper and it should ask the Senate for restoration of all funds deleted by this Committee, including those for lines paralleling company lines. I would further expect the Department to be back here before this House next year with a completely new program for a power system independent of those of the power companies which are trying to pull the wool over the eyes of your Appropriation Committee and this House of the Congress of the United States.

How badly is the public power program hurt? The figures show it quite clearly:

The budget estimates for power facilities and transmission lines in the Reclamation section of the Interior bill total \$73,603,504. The proposed reduction of \$26,690,000 would slice more than 35 percent off of the budget estimates for power and transmission lines. It would leave \$46,913,504 for these vital purposes.

Should the amendment be interpreted to apply only to transmission facilities, the effect would be even more drastic. The total budget estimates for transmission lines, as submitted to the Congress, are \$33,881,313. The Appropriation Subcommittee in the bill before this Committee recommended reductions in specific transmission line estimates of \$7,596,000, about evenly divided between the Central Valley project, in California, and the Missouri River Basin project. This is money not required because of the wheeling agreements.

Should the cut below the budget estimate of \$26,690,000 be applied to the total budget estimates for transmission lines there would remain \$7,191,313 for

extending facilities to deliver publicly produced power to defense installations, rural electrification customers, irrigation districts, public utility districts, municipalities, and other preference customers pursuant to law.

Thousands and thousands of rural residents in the Dakotas, Montana, Nebraska, and other States of the Missouri River Basin have been clamoring for extension of Reclamation lines to give power service that could not or would not be supplied by private utilities. At the behest of these good people who have been waiting for public power for many years, this program was recommended. It has been supported by our colleagues from these States, as well as others, and they are entitled to have their constituents get public power service that has been denied them by the private utilities.

As I have stated, the defense program in many sections of the West would be critically hampered by the slow-down of the Reclamation power program through reduced appropriations for power and transmission lines. The defense program to our minds includes irrigated agricultural production.

I hope the Committee will vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have a booklet here—I call it the white paper of the power monopoly—entitled "You Draw the Line Between Essential and Unnecessary Federal Power Projects" put out by the National Association of Electric Companies. I wish everyone would read it together with my comments on the allegations contained in the booklet. It is as follows:

YOU DRAW THE LINE BETWEEN ESSENTIAL AND UNNECESSARY FEDERAL POWER PROJECTS—ELECTRIC COMPANIES OFFER COUNTERPROPOSALS THAT WILL SAVE AMERICA 80,000 TONS OF SCARCE METALS AND REDUCE FEDERAL SPENDING \$173,900,000

WHERE?

Yes, where draw the line between things Government should and should not do?

We believe that a proper function of democratic government is to help people to do those jobs that need doing—and that they cannot do for themselves. If democracy is to endure, however, government must encourage people to do for themselves those things they can and are willing to do. We believe that when government insists on doing jobs that people themselves can do, it is a sign bureaucracy is putting its own interests first, not the people's.

For example, construction of economically sound multiple-purpose dams to promote flood control and reclamation and improve navigation is a proper government function. But even so, government should encourage the people to carry on whatever of these or related activities they can.

Marketing of electric power at large government dams is a case in point.

In appropriation bills now under consideration by Congress, the Department of In-

terior is asking for money to construct transmission lines which, in many cases, are unnecessary, since electric companies already have the lines and are doing the job. In other cases funds are being asked to build lines in areas where electric companies with a minimum of lines construction can market the power at no cost to taxpayers.

The Department of Interior is also requesting a new spending device—the continuing fund. Continuing funds for Federal power projects are exactly what the name implies—funds continually replenished from proceeds of the sale of Federal power. Once the continuing fund is approved by Congress, it does not need annual reappropriation. Thus, these revenues, meant to liquidate the taxpayers' investment in the power features of multiple-purpose projects would be dissipated to expand Federal power operations.

Seven cases where Federal agencies are asking for funds to do things they need not do are cited in this booklet. In each case electric companies—financed, built, and run by United States citizens—are ready, as they have always been, to do the job at less cost and with the use of fewer scarce metals.

Here are seven sure ways to reduce Federal spending. The electric company plans would save the nation 80,000 tons of Government-rationed metals and the taxpayers \$22,700,000 in fiscal year 1952 alone; eventual savings would amount to \$173,900,000.

IN THE SOUTHWEST

Background: The Southwestern Power Administration was created within the Department of Interior to market power from flood control-power dams built by the Army Engineers in Arkansas, Louisiana, Kansas, Missouri, Texas, and Oklahoma. In 1946 it asked Congress to authorize an extensive construction program that included steam plants and competitive transmission lines. Congress refused. Since then this agency has been getting Congressional approval of its over-all program on a piecemeal basis. In its 1952 budget request, SWPA is asking for funds to build facilities that will carry it closer to its regional-wide power empire.

Government plan

SWPA this year requests \$4,100,000 to carry forward its extensive competitive transmission system. Of this amount, \$2,535,000 would be for construction already under way, and \$1,565,000 for new construction, primarily in Missouri. SWPA also has been authorized to use a \$300,000 self-replenishing continuing fund to attain its objectives of a multi-State power system. This fund would be used to buy steam-generated power and to lease, with option to purchase, vast transmission systems from other Government agencies. SWPA already has obligated its \$300,000 continuing fund in the amount of \$66,000,000, which it will spend unless stopped by Congress. This is more than twice the \$28,000,000 Congress has directly appropriated to SWPA for construction.

Company program

This spending would be unnecessary if the companies in the area were permitted to proceed with their plans. For example, the Empire District Electric Co. of Joplin, Mo., has offered to negotiate a contract with SWPA to transmit Federal power over its lines and to build new lines if needed. Such a contract would carry out all necessary Government obligations and therefore make unnecessary \$1,560,600 of the current request and \$2,936,250 previously appropriated. If the agency would accept the principle of negotiated contracts, this Federal power spending would be unnecessary.

What you save: Acceptance of the companies' program and abolishment of the continuing fund would mean eventual savings of at least \$71,000,000 to taxpayers.

IN THE SOUTHEAST

Background: The Southeastern Power Administration, a new agency of the Department of Interior, is responsible for marketing power from Federal flood-control dams in 10 Southeastern States. SEPA argues that it should build transmission lines from these projects to market centers, instead of using existing facilities or facilities that could be provided by business institutions.

Government plan

SEPA is asking Congress for a total of \$4,500,000 for fiscal year 1952. It wants \$200,000 for a continuing fund, \$300,000 for operation and maintenance, and \$4,000,000 for construction of transmission lines. This latter amount would be in addition to \$1,850,000 made available in the 1951 Supplemental Appropriation Act for partial construction of a transmission line from the Buggs Island Dam to Langley Field in Virginia. Thus, if all requests are approved, SEPA would have available \$5,850,000 for construction in the 1951-52 fiscal years. It would use these funds for lines in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia.

In addition to 1951 and 1952 funds, SEPA would require \$25,720,200 in subsequent years to complete this initial program, or a total of \$31,570,000.

Company program

Electric companies in the area have offered to cooperate with Government to market Federal hydroelectric power to all people in the area. If required, they will use their lines to transmit power to customers having preferred claims under Federal statutes. These objectives can be achieved: (1) Without spending tax funds to build and operate a Federal power system, and (2) without a continuing fund. The companies will build any additional lines that might be necessary at no cost to taxpayers.

What you save: By using existing integrated facilities and by building short additional lines, the companies' program would save taxpayers \$6,350,000 this year and eventually a total of \$31,750,000 on the initial program alone.

IN CALIFORNIA

Background: The Central Valley project is essentially a water development. It was conceived and created for the purpose of irrigating the fertile lands of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys. The project was authorized in 1933 by the Legislature of California and in 1937 it was taken over by the Federal Government under an act of Congress. This statute included a provision for the generation and sale of electric energy as a means of financially aiding and assisting the water features of the project. From the very beginning, however, the Bureau of Reclamation has placed primary emphasis on power features, preferring to build its own duplicating power network.

Government plan

For transmission lines, substations, and switchyards in California's Central Valley, the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior is asking \$5,506,478 in fiscal year 1952. The Bureau estimates these facilities will cost \$24,861,893 when completed. The Bureau has already spent enormous sums to begin its own power system in the Central Valley.

Company program

The company serving the area—the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.—has for years demonstrated and proved its ability to provide for the constantly expanding power needs of people in its service area efficiently and at reasonable cost. It constantly demonstrates its ability and willingness to cooperate with the Federal Government and to assume full and complete responsibility for doing its job. On the basis of its demonstrated willingness

and ability to fulfill its responsibility, these items are unessential.

What you save: By adopting the company program, Federal spending would be reduced in fiscal 1952 alone by \$5,506,478; eventually, \$24,861,893.

IN THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN—IOWA, MONTANA

Background: As part of its \$306,000,000 Missouri River Basin transmission line program in the Midwest and Western States, the Bureau of Reclamation wants funds to start work next year on certain transmission facilities in Iowa and Montana. According to the Government, a power shortage exists in the Missouri Basin area, and it contends these new facilities are necessary to ease that shortage.

Government plan

Montana: \$2,351,450 is requested to start construction of four transmission lines that will cost an estimated \$7,630,000 when completed.

Iowa: The Bureau of Reclamation wants to spend \$894,400 during the next fiscal year to complete surveys, undertake designs, and issue specifications for several transmission lines and a substation in this general area. The over-all plans for this area would eventually cost \$30,589,000.

Company program

The Montana Power Co. is ready to do the whole power transmission job in its area. The company now serves all rural electric cooperatives that could be served by the lines proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation. The cooperatives are buying power wholesale from the Montana Power Co. at the Bureau of Reclamation rate. Through company-Government agreements already concluded, and through interconnection of company lines with Government plants, an integrated system is now in use for transmission of both public and private power in the area.

Iowa lines proposed by the Bureau would duplicate company lines already in operation, as well as future extensions planned to strengthen company facilities. Companies, cooperatives, and municipalities in Iowa have a long history of working together successfully in achieving power objectives. Existing facilities and those planned will provide ample Missouri River power for all customers, including preference customers of the Government.

What you save:

Montana: The entire \$2,351,450 for fiscal 1952 could be saved by accepting the company program. Future savings would be \$7,620,000.

Iowa: Most of the \$894,400 for fiscal 1952 could be saved and eventually a total of \$30,589,000.

IN IDAHO

Background: A great debate is developing here whether the Bureau of Reclamation is primarily interested in sound reclamation to develop southern Idaho, or wants to create an unregulated Government power monopoly. This vast region is served by the Idaho Power Co. Its service area is principally agricultural, and people are economically dependent upon storage and use of water for irrigation and upon continuation of a sound reclamation program.

Government plan

The Bureau of Reclamation wants \$1,300,000 to start construction this year of a new 30,000-kilowatt power plant on the west side of the Snake River at American Falls and says the plant is needed to provide more power for the area. Its eventual cost would be \$6,600,000.

Company program

The Idaho Power Co. is already providing all present customers and is ready and willing to serve prospective customers with ample power. The Idaho Power Co. already has a 27,000-kilowatt power plant on the east

side of the Snake River, at the same location. There is not enough water at American Falls for two plants. The proposed plant would put the company plant out of business. Thus, at a cost of \$6,600,000 to taxpayers, the Government plant would add only 4,300 kilowatts of average capacity.

What you save: The company program would reduce Federal spending by \$6,600,000. In addition, citizens in the county where the plant would be located would not be burdened with an annual tax loss of \$55,000 that is now being paid by the company. This, divided up among the 388 farms in the county, would amount to \$140 per farm.

IN COLORADO

Background: The Bureau of Reclamation's Colorado-Big Thompson project will bring Colorado River water through the Continental Divide to the State's eastern plains by means of one of the world's longest tunnels. Power will be produced at project plants. As elsewhere in the country, the Department of the Interior wants to build all the transmission facilities to market power.

Government plan

As part of its power program for the area, the Bureau of Reclamation wants to start construction of a transmission line from Estes to Leyner, plus a substation at Leyner, in fiscal 1952. The total estimated cost of the transmission line is \$435,000 and \$100,000 is being requested for work in 1952. Although funds are requested for a substation at Leyner, the exact amount for use in 1952 is not known. The total cost for this facility was given a year ago as \$300,400. Leyner is located 25 miles from Denver.

Company program

The Public Service Co. of Colorado recommends an alternative program as a result of extensive studies it has made of how best to serve the area. Under this alternative program the Government and the company each would do part of the job. Instead of building the Estes-to-Leyner line mentioned above, the Government would construct a transmission line between Estes and Pole Hill, a switching station at Pole Hill, and an addition at Flairon. The company then would build an 8½-mile line between Valmont and Leyner, and expand its Valmont substation.

What you save: The Government plan calls for spending \$735,000. The company's program calls for the expenditure by the company of \$440,000, and by the Government of only \$405,000. Savings under the company plan, which does the same job, would be \$330,000.

IN EASTERN OREGON

Background: The Bonneville Power Administration is the marketing agency for Federal hydro projects on the Columbia River in the Northwest. It has already built an extensive transmission-line system. Each and every year it extends its lines so that it is constantly increasing the area within which it operates. This year it is asking for funds to extend its lines further into eastern Oregon with Idaho as its ultimate goal.

Government plan

In northeastern Oregon the Bonneville Power Administration plans to build a transmission line from McNary Dam on the Columbia River to Baker, Oreg., at an ultimate cost of \$5,471,000. Of this amount, \$1,379,000 has been made available to build the line from McNary Dam as far as La Grande. It wants to transmit power from the dam to what it calls a power shortage area in eastern Oregon. McNary Dam is not yet producing power. For fiscal 1952, the Government wants \$54,000 to start surveys on extending the line from La Grande southeast to Baker. Eventual cost of extension facilities would be \$2,140,000. No part of either line is under construction.

Company program

The California-Pacific Utilities Co., serving four counties in eastern Oregon has more than doubled its electric lines and tripled its power supply in the past 5 years. The company serves all communities and about 100 percent of all farms in its area.

Although there is a general power shortage in the Northwest, a region dominated by Government power, the California-Pacific Utilities Co. is meeting all needs for power in its own area.

What you save: By rejecting Interior's plan to move eastward in Oregon as clearly unnecessary, Federal spending would be reduced by \$5,471,000. When McNary Dam does start producing small amounts of power 2 years hence, it and more besides will be needed in western Oregon and Washington where the country's greatest power shortage exists.

You draw the line.

This booklet cites seven concrete—not theoretical—cases where Federal spending can be cut without interfering with necessary governmental services.

If you believe, as we do, that Government—in cooperation with industry—can cut the Federal budget and lighten the tax load, you should make your beliefs known to the Congress.

Your Congressmen want to hear from you.

COMMENTS ON PAMPHLET, YOU DRAW THE LINE,
BY NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ELECTRIC COMPANIES.

The preface of the pamphlet states:

We believe that a proper function of democratic government is to help people do those jobs that need doing—and that they cannot do for themselves. * * * Government must encourage people to do for themselves those things they can and are willing to do.

The NAEC pamphlet apparently limits its definition of people to meaning utility companies only. Federal power legislation has been approved by the Congress for the purpose of helping all kinds of people, not just power companies. This legislation recognizes as people not only consumers generally, but farmers who want adequate power supplies at reasonable rates and workers who want water resources to provide stable and adequate employment. The elected representatives have provided a way for these people to do for themselves those things they can and are willing to do. These consumers, including business and farmers who need adequate power at low cost, have turned to the Federal Government to get it, because they have been unable to get the power companies in times past to meet these needs. They have asked the Federal Government through various legislation to provide power facilities, including high-voltage transmission lines, to supply the farms, the communities, and the industrial developments with adequate supplies of low-cost power.

The Bonneville Act, for example, was not a product of the bureaucrats. It was a product of diverse Northwest interests working through such elected representatives as the late Senator Charles McNary, of Oregon, and former Senator Homer T. Bone, of Washington.

On page 1 of the NAEC document it says:

Electric companies already have the (transmission) lines and are doing the job.

The companies are not doing the job. Fifteen years ago 90 percent of the farms

of the richest and most modern Nation on the earth were without electricity. While 10 percent of our farmers had electrical connections, Germany had 90 percent electrified, Japan had 90 percent, and Italy and France each had 94 percent of their farms electrified. Even today, the rural areas of the United States are still only 86-percent electrified.

This is a national disgrace.

It will continue to be a national disgrace until every one in this country who needs electricity can get electricity at low cost.

The publication also states on page 1 that the "electric companies with a minimum of line construction can market the power at no cost to taxpayers." They say nothing of what the cost to consumers, who are the taxpayers, will be if the companies attain complete monopoly of the hydroelectric power generated in the dams which were built by and for the people. In the Flood Control Act of 1944 the Congress set forth the guiding principle of the manner in which hydroelectric power from Federal projects would be marketed. That act states that the Government hydroelectric power and energy "shall be marketed in the manner to encourage the most widespread use thereof." To accomplish this objective, the Department of the Interior, which is responsible for marketing the power from projects built by the Corps of Engineers, as well as for projects built by the Department of the Interior, is prosecuting a program of active cooperation with the rural electric cooperatives. Through this means power is delivered to farms and homes, small rural businesses and manufacturing organizations, and small communities and towns. These classes of customers have been surely neglected as to service and have been discriminated against as to rate by the private utility companies through the years of America's greatest development.

It must be understood that the action of the Government in encouraging the most widespread use of electric power is not a grant or a subsidy. The Department of the Interior is marketing electricity at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, and at rates which provide not only for meeting cost of operation and maintenance and replacements, but also for amortizing the investment in the Government power operation including interest. For example, in the Southwest area, for every dollar appropriated by the Congress for investment of the generation of hydroelectric power and the transmission thereof in the Southwest, the Southwestern Power Administration is returning \$1.76. This is marketing power at no cost to taxpayers and is providing power at the lowest possible cost to those who use it.

The report states that "The electric company plans would save the Nation 80,000 tons of metals and the taxpayers \$22,700,000 in fiscal year 1952 alone" with eventual savings of \$173,900,000. That is nonsense. In all cases where existing facilities will meet the need for transmission of Federal power at rea-

sonable cost for wheeling, those arrangements have been effectuated. New facilities needed to dispose of additional power will require critical metals whether built privately for the benefit of a few or publicly for the benefit of the many. The cost in dollars and materials will be the same either way, but public construction will bring to preference customers the advantages of low-cost Federal power, at no cost to the taxpayers.

The NAEC pamphlet, in the interest of private power monopoly, suggests seven cases where they would like to see Federal agencies hampered in carrying out Federal power policy. Those seven areas are, first, Southwest; second, Southeast; third, California; fourth, Missouri River basin—Montana; fifth, Idaho; sixth, Colorado; seventh, eastern Oregon.

In that order I refute the claims presented by the utilities relative to the provision of electric facilities in the 1952 appropriations.

IN THE SOUTHWEST

In its specific attack on Southwestern Power Administration, the publication sets forth the statement:

In 1946 it (SPA) asked Congress to authorize an extensive construction program that included steam plants and competitive transmission lines.

The fact of the matter is that in 1946, Southwestern Power Administration presented to Congress a comprehensive report showing the transmission system and steam generation which would be necessary to market the hydroelectric power generated by Government dams in the Southwest if no other electric generation and transmission facilities were in existence in that area.

The companies themselves refuted their own loud cries about duplicate facilities in June 1949, when an Electric Bond & Share engineer published in that month's Electric Light and Power an article entitled "System Planning for Bulk Power Supply." This article set forth the facilities which would be needed, in addition to the facilities already existing, to market the hydroelectric power generated by the Government flood-control projects in the Southwest. The system set forth by the Electric Bond & Share Co. engineers in that article is even more extensive than the one Southwestern Power Administration told Congress would be necessary if no other generation and transmission facilities existed in this area. Furthermore, the map of proposed Bond & Share transmission system shows hundreds of miles of new high-voltage transmission lines depicting so-called duplication, that twin transmission lines marching across the country side by side to insure dependable service.

Another misstatement appears in the publication, *You Draw the Line*, in which Southwestern Power Administration's budget for 1952 is broken down into construction under way and new construction. The fact of the matter is that Southwestern Power Administration, recognizing metals should be conserved for the present defense effort, asked for no new construction in its 1952 budget. All of the construction for

which funds were asked in the 1952 budget have been approved by Congress in the 1951 budget.

The continuing fund of \$300,000, which has been authorized by Congress for Southwestern Power Administration, is primarily for use in emergencies, such as damage to electric lines from wind and ice storms. These repairs cannot wait on year-to-year appropriations. It is also necessary because the Southwestern Power Administration has negotiated mutually advantageous contracts with electric cooperatives and companies in the Southwest to secure the economy and efficiency inherent in integration of hydroelectric and fuel-generated electric power.

The statement, "This fund would be used to buy steam-generated power and to lease, with option to purchase, vast transmission systems from other Government agencies," is an absolute falsehood. In purchasing steam-generated power from the generation and transmission cooperatives referred to here, Southwestern Power Administration is following the same principle of enhancing the value of its hydroelectric power as it uses in its contractual arrangement with private utility companies. Leasing the transmission systems of the generation and transmission cooperatives is not leasing from "other Government agencies" since the cooperatives are owned by private citizens of the United States just as are the private utility companies.

The statement that Southwestern Power Administration is obligated in the amount of \$66,000,000 is utterly ridiculous, since Southwestern Power Administration cannot advance its program one degree without first asking and obtaining the consent of the Congress each year.

The publication's statement of the companies' program is entirely misleading, since the Southwestern Power Administration has already negotiated and executed contracts with companies in its area who are willing to negotiate and operate on a fair and square basis to secure the greatest good for the greatest number of people in the matter of power use.

The principle of negotiated contracts, contrary to the statement in *You Draw the Line*, is satisfactorily provided that the negotiated contracts further the greatest good for the greatest number, rather than the greatest grab for the greatest grabbers.

IN THE SOUTHEAST

Southeastern Power Administration is asking Congress for a total of \$4,500,000 for fiscal year 1952. It wants \$200,000 for continuing fund, \$300,000 for operation and maintenance, and \$4,000,000 for construction of transmission lines.

The companies claim by using existing integrated facilities and by building short additional lines, the companies' program would save taxpayers \$6,350,000 this year and eventually a total of \$31,750,000 on the initial program alone. The companies fail to point out the all funds advanced to the Southeastern Power Administration are repaid to the Treasury of the United States to-

gether with interest and, therefore, do not cost the taxpayers or the Government anything. These facilities are a business investment on the part of the Government paid for 100 percent by the consumers. Most of the appropriations requested this year was to permit the Southeastern Power Administration to provide service to the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics at Langley Field. The total cost of these facilities was about \$7,000,000, the total amount of which would be returned to the Federal Treasury with interest. The statement fails to mention that the Virginia Electric Co. was demanding a connection charge of \$4,100,000 to provide service to this Government facility. This payment would have been a direct cost to the taxpayers. Therefore, the program of the Southeastern Power Administration this year alone has saved the Government \$4,100,000, as well as greatly reducing the rates to be paid by the Government for service at Langley Field. The companies are claiming that the Government should use the existing facilities of the companies or that the companies would be willing to build any new transmission lines needed. The companies, of course, will demand just compensation for the use of their facilities. Such payments for use of company facilities would be the same as the payments for the operation, maintenance, and amortization of Government transmission lines. The rate payer will not save any money, because of the offer of the companies, nor will the taxpayer be burdened or unburdened by the offer of the companies. On the contrary, the rate payers are bearing greater burdens. They will not receive the benefits of cheap power. The companies are saying that, if the preference customer is to receive the benefits of the Government power, then they shall have the right to extract their toll.

CALIFORNIA

Contrary to the statement in the paragraph entitled "Background," to the effect that the "Central Valley project is essentially a water development project" and the "Bureau of Reclamation has placed primary emphasis on power features," this project is authorized as a multipurpose project for the purposes of flood control, irrigation, power, domestic water uses, navigation, and miscellaneous purposes. These miscellaneous purposes included salinity repulsion, fish protection, and recreation. Primary emphasis has never been placed on power features. As of the end of fiscal year 1950, June 30, 1950, the investment in power features only was \$61,433,934 as compared to a total investment, already made up to that date, of \$319,963,130. Of the total ultimate estimated cost of \$625,288,900—which includes the American River Folsom Power Development—the estimated investment in power facilities only will be \$197,228,930.

The Bureau of Reclamation is not building a duplicating power network. Even with the two new 230-kilovolt lines which the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. rushed into construction after having claimed no new lines were required.

the present power network in central and northern California, without the Bureau lines, is incapable of properly carrying the additional power generated at the Shasta and Keswick power plants of the project. It should also be recognized that the company until very recently refused to agree to wheel Federal power over its lines to preference customers of the Government, including power for municipalities, cooperatives, and even Federal establishments of the Army, Navy or Air Forces, as well as other agencies of the Government. Inasmuch as by Federal law and by departmental policy, the Bureau is required to first give preference to such public agencies and cooperatives; second, to sell power at the lowest rates to the ultimate customers consistent with good business practice; third, to encourage widespread use, and, fourth, prevent monopolization, it was necessary that the Government construct a trunk power transmission system to accomplish these requirements.

Irrigation, power, and other facilities of the Central Valley project are being developed in an orderly and logical fashion and to state that the Bureau of Reclamation has placed primary emphasis on power features is contrary to the facts. Actually the majority of the features constructed to date are not power features but features required for control and utilization of the water. These include Friant Dam, Shasta Dam, Tracy pumping plant and all canals and canal works.

With Shasta Dam completed, failure to make use of the power drop, particularly when California desperately needs power, would not only have been inexcusably wasteful but criminally negligent. As of June 30, 1950, the project has return from power revenues to the Treasury approximately \$25,500,000 net. In addition the construction has been proceeding as fast as economically feasible to provide water for irrigation which will start on a large scale this year. In addition the project has contributed approximately 8,200,000,000 kilowatt-hours during a period to time when such energy was desperately needed. This hydroelectric energy incidentally has saved fuel consumption equivalent to at least 16,000,000 barrels of oil.

Since the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has now agreed by contract to wheel energy over their lines on terms that the Government can accept as being consistent with Federal law and policy, the immediate need for three of the lines with substations included in the \$5,506,478 budget request for fiscal year 1952 became unnecessary. The House Appropriations Committee was accordingly notified and these items were deleted. The remaining lines are considered necessary in any case.

The claims of savings to the public made by the company program are misleading and not true. Even if all the lines were to be omitted from the budget and instead a wheeling contract over Pacific Gas & Electric Co.'s lines were arranged, the revenue to the private company from its wheeling charge, which would have to be paid by the Bureau of

Reclamation, would on an annual basis approximate the savings claimed. The article very carefully avoids any statement that would show charges must be paid for transmission if Federal lines are not built.

The statements in the bulletin totally ignore the facts that first, expenditures by the Government for power facilities are fully reimbursable; second, the power facilities constructed are only those essential to carrying out the Federal law and policy; and, third, the power facilities constructed are highly beneficial to the people in that they conserve and make available to the people the hydroelectric potentialities which belong to them. Such resources are made available to the people at the lowest cost rather than benefiting a private monopoly at the people's expense by interposing it as a middle man whose primary purpose is to make a profit.

IN THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN—MONTANA

As stated in the paragraph entitled "Background" there has for a long time been a power shortage existing in the Missouri Basin area. The development of the power generation and transmission features of the Missouri Basin project now under way by the Government will bring great economic improvement in the Missouri Basin, particularly to the States of Montana and North and South Dakota. The potentialities of these areas have been greatly neglected, with the result that they are now substandard insofar as power supply and utilization are concerned.

The Congress, in the past several years, has provided the funds for the construction of a number of federally owned transmission lines in order to bring the Federal power supply at low cost to preferred customers. At the same time, the Bureau has been negotiating agreements with the Montana Power Co., as well as other utilities, looking to the possible utilization of spare capacity in existing lines to wheel Federal power to the Government's preferred customers. For a long time the Montana Power Co. would not agree to a reasonable arrangement which justified a wheeling contract; although about a year ago this company suddenly reduced its rates very materially to REA cooperatives only. This is a class of customers entitled to preference from Government systems which has been particularly concerned with obtaining an ample supply of Government power. Recently an agreement was made and contract negotiations completed with the power company for wheeling and leasing arrangements which would permit the Government to use excess capacity in the Montana Power Co. lines rather than construct certain lines previously proposed. While these contracts necessitate paying wheeling charges to the company so that the preferred customer pays not less than and in some cases—at least temporarily—more than if the Government had its own lines, the arrangement does permit, first, early service to preferred customers heretofore not served with Government power; second, more efficient use of existing transmis-

sion lines; and, third, saving of immediate capital expenditures by the Government for construction of certain transmission lines. Under this arrangement the company gains by obtaining substantial new revenues for its presently unused transmission capacity. The arrangement will not result in the Government or the ultimate customer making any large saving in the long run, because the wheeling charges which will be paid to the company may ultimately be about equal to the cost of constructing and operating Government-owned lines. The Government reserves the right to terminate the contract if the arrangement proves not to be in the public interest, as would be the case if the wheeling charges exceed the annual costs of owning and operating alternative Government lines.

The Bureau of Reclamation's request for \$2,351,450 for fiscal year 1952 funds to start construction of four transmission lines in Montana was voluntarily reduced as soon as the wheeling and leasing contract was made with the Montana Power Co. The Canyon Ferry-Three Forks-Anaconda transmission line and the Canyon Ferry-Great Falls transmission line were eliminated from the request therefor. A total of only \$895,000 is now requested for fiscal year 1952 for transmission lines in Montana. These consist of the Miles City-Yellowtail transmission line, a part of the Bureau's ultimate backbone system which will complete connection of the Yellowtail power plant and Wyoming system with the Fort Peck and Garrison power plants, and the Billings-Yellowtail transmission line which is required to supply construction power for Yellowtail Dam and will later be used to integrate and interconnect the power systems in Montana. The Montana Power Co. does not have lines in existence which would meet the needs served by the requested lines.

IN IDAHO

Here again there are incomplete and incorrect statements which are not borne out by facts.

The bulletin states that the American Falls power plant of the Bureau will be 30,000 kilowatts and the present company plant is 27,000 kilowatts and there is not enough water for both.

The facts in the case are that when the American Falls Dam was constructed in 1925-27 provision was made in the construction of the dam to produce power at a later date. The power company already had a power plant which makes use of the natural head at American Falls but this is only half of the head now available. The Government power plant to be constructed will utilize the full head due to the falls and to the dam constructed above the falls. This head, as stated above, is approximately twice that now being used at the company plant. The result will be that the average annual energy produced at American Falls will be increased from 150,000,000 kilowatt-hours now produced at the company plant to 280,000,000 kilowatt-hours from both the Government plant and the company plant. Therefore, the construction of the American

Falls power plant will add about 130,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually of generation at the American Falls site.

The statement is made that there is not enough water for two plants and that the proposed plant would put the company plant out of business. These statements are at variance with the facts. A study indicates that the company plant may still be operated during 8 months of the year and that in 5 of these 8 months there would be enough water to develop the full output of both plants. If it were not for the requirement of providing water for the present company plant, all the water during these months could be used at the proposed plant and the capacity raised to 85,000 kilowatts instead of the total of 57,000 kilowatts for the present proposed plant and the company plant. It is pointed out that over 25 years ago the United States paid the Idaho Power Co. a million dollars for American Falls water rights which will be used in operation of the new plant. This water has been used continuously ever since by the Idaho power plant because the Government had no plant to utilize this water right. Naturally the company is loathe to be deprived of the Government water it has and is using.

The statement is made in the Bulletin that \$55,000 a year would be lost in taxes due to the closing down of the company plant. In view of the explanation of the operation of these two plants in the above paragraph, this statement cannot be supported. The construction of the proposed plant will provide, among other things, pumping energy for the North Side pumping division of the Minidoka project which will irrigate 77,650 acres of new land. No estimate has been made as to how much local taxes will be increased but certainly such new taxes will more than offset any decrease in taxes caused by reduced operation of the company's plant.

The development of these new acreages makes it plain that the Bureau of Reclamation is interested in a sound reclamation program in this area despite NAEC misstatements.

IN COLORADO

The statement in the paragraph headed "Background" says that "the Department of the Interior wants to build all the transmission facilities to market power." This has no more basis than previous statements in the bulletin already discussed. The fact that the Government has entered into wheeling arrangements with the Public Service Co. of Colorado when it is in the public good shows that it is not the intent to construct all transmission facilities. Obviously, however, the Government in accordance with law and policy must assure itself that other means of transmission such as wheeling arrangements are more in public interest than direct transmission over Government facilities. The Government has voluntarily changed the request for the Estes-Leyner transmission line and substation following the consummation of the wheeling arrangements originally in the 1952 budget. In technical collaboration with the Public

Service Co. of Colorado, it was determined that this line and substation would not be required until about 1957. However, it was jointly agreed that a line from Estes to Polehill was necessary and the Bureau's request includes this. The request for \$100,000 for fiscal year 1952 remains unchanged, but the total cost of the presently proposed and needed line will be considerably less than the Estes-Leyner line and substation.

In connection with savings, again, it should be mentioned that payment by the Government to the company for wheeling power will effectually offset any savings realized by the lesser investment on the part of the Government.

IN EASTERN OREGON

First. The statement that "no part of either line—McNary-LaGrande and LaGrande Baker—is under construction" is misleading.

As stated in foregoing paragraphs, right-of-way was first acquired on authorization 9 years ago. Funds for design and materials from McNary to LaGrande have been spent. Construction contract has been awarded.

Second. The statement that the "California Pacific Utilities Co. has more than doubled its electric lines and tripled its power supply in the past 5 years" is misleading.

The company has no adequate power supply of its own. It depends, to a considerable extent, upon the purchase of power from the Idaho Power Co. at Baker. On November 16, 1949, Mr. E. K. Albert, vice president and chief engineer of the California-Oregon Power Co., told a BPA representative that the Idaho Power Co.'s present Baker-LaGrande, 66-kilovolt circuit is loaded to capacity. He stated further that the proposed BPA line from McNary Dam to LaGrande would have to be completed in the near future to supply the company's needs from the Bonneville system at LaGrande.

Adequate transmission from the Idaho Power Co. system to Baker, Oreg., is also inadequate. The company has included in its program construction of a line from Huntington, Oreg., to Baker. This line has not been completed because its right-of-way crosses public lands, and the company has refused to accede to the terms of the permit it requests from the Bureau of Land Management that the unused capacity of such a line would be available for the use by the Federal Government.

Third. Early in April of 1950-51, the Idaho Power Co. and the California Pacific Power Co. opposed the allotment of materials by the Defense Electric Power Administration to the McNary-LaGrande line, on the basis that this will be a wasteful use of such critical materials. On April 16, 1951, after study of the circumstances and justifications for the line, the Defense Electric Power Administration approved the use of materials for this construction, thereby rejecting the power company's objections.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, although I intend to speak on this amendment, on the other hand I think in the interest of saving time, as the debate goes on, probably some of my remarks will be addressed to other amendments that I know are going to come.

I think it is important to remember certain things. One thing, of course, is that all of us in this House, on both sides of the aisle, are for economy in the sense that we want to save money if we can. On the other hand, I think perhaps we have overlooked something in this particular bill, and it may not apply to other bills, so I mention it here. This bill that we are considering here today is probably one of the few, if not the only bill, we will have that goes right to the heart and soul of everything that tends to make America the great Nation that it is. It also probably is more connected with the defense effort and whether or not in the long run this Nation will survive, than any other bill we are going to consider.

In considering economy, in thinking about saving dollars and cents, I think we also have to give some thought to what there is in this bill and whether or not any real saving can be made. We all know that what makes this country great, of course, is not only the people in this country but basically and fundamentally it is what we have in this country. It is the great natural resources that we have; it is our fields, our plains, our valleys, our rivers; it is the minerals beneath the soil; it is the fuel and liquids and gases; it is all those things. And if we do not have those things and if we do not protect them and if we do not develop our resources, this country is losing probably the elements that tend to make it one of the greatest nations in the world.

You can talk all you want to about these different matters but the fact of the matter is that this bill and the money you are spending this week under this bill has to do with conserving what we have, in building up what we have, and in seeking to make it available not only for the benefit of all the people in peacetime, but also in wartime.

I is intimately tied into our food production and it is intimately tied up to our industrial output. It has to do directly and intimately with the minerals that we have. It has to do with our water supply. It has to do with all those things.

As the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has told you many, many times, one of the greatest crimes this country has committed has been what we permitted to happen to our top soil. Our conservation policy that is so important to this country is taken care of in this bill. Our resources, and whether or not we are going to find any and whether or not we need any more—and we all know that foreign sources are rapidly being shut off—are all taken care of and provided for in this bill. Take our great forests. What happened to them? It

is the same thing here. Think of the minerals and metals that have to do with wartime and peacetime production. Wars cannot be fought without them; this country cannot be defended without them. They are all in this bill.

When you talk about saving money in some bills, you save money, and there is no harm. But we do not want to try to save money at the expense of resources more valuable than money. We do not want to save money and lose America. Let us remember there are a good many elements of wealth, and it is not only the dollars piled up. There are other types of wealth that are perhaps more important in the long run, and you must remember that every time you whittle down and save dollars in this fashion, at the same time you are whittling down on the resources of America. You are increasing the waste that has been going down our rivers with the topsoil. You are losing part of the strength of America.

It is easy for us to understand how you can save money. A man may have a herd of cattle that is worth a great deal of money, perhaps \$1,000,000. He may be faced with a decision as to whether or not he will put up a fence to keep those cattle in. It may cost him \$1,000. He does not have to spend the \$1,000 if he does not want to, but he may lose \$1,000,000 if he does not.

All of us in our private lives perhaps carry insurance, whether it is for merchandise or on our own lives. In going over your personal family budget you can see where you can save \$50 or \$100 a month, but you do not take the chance because that \$50 or \$100 a month may in the long run cost you several thousand dollars in loss.

That question applies to this bill. This bill is the insurance of America.

One other point: We in this country like to feel that we perhaps are doing something for the Nation, that we are going to pass on to our children and to other generations something in this Nation. This is the bill that provides those things for America.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. May I call the gentleman's attention to this fact, and I am sure he knows it, that the particular amendment we are considering now concerns the perpetual resource of the United States, the water. Once the dam is built, it may be good for centuries and centuries.

Mr. FURCOLO. That is right.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Whether or not I agree with the gentleman, I want to make the observation that I do not believe it possible that a more perfect statement in support of the position the gentleman takes could have been made by anyone.

Mr. FURCOLO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I also want to compliment the gentleman on making a very splendid statement. It is a broad, statesmanlike view he takes. He is building for the future.

So many times we hear some thoughtless person say, "What has posterity done for me that I should do anything for it?" Yet this Republic was founded for the benefit of ourselves and our posterity. That is exactly what the gentleman is saying and I highly commend him for it.

It has been pointed out here that so-called saving at this time on Government power facilities is saving at the spigot and wasting at the bung. I will give an example. Before the Second World War we had begun the building of the Davis Dam, but we stopped in the midst of it. The estimated cost of the dam at that time was about \$45,000,000. After the war was over, we continued with the building of the dam, and it is producing power today which will be an important part of our national defense, as the gentleman says. But when we resumed operations in building it, it cost twice the amount of money that was estimated previously. That is what we are up against.

Mr. FURCOLO. I thank the gentleman very much. I think without any question that while we all want to save money, when you want to build houses and the forests are gone, you cannot say you can build houses with dollars. It does not mean anything.

Without fuel gas, and oil the engines of war cannot operate. We can save \$10,000,000 on this, but let our tanks be stalled somewhere and that \$10,000,000 will not be worth anything, not 10 cents.

All through this bill, wherever you are saving a penny you have to remember that you are also cutting down on something that is basic and essential. Perhaps it does not apply to other bills, but in this bill, whittle away, if you will, but every time you do you are whittling away at something that is the basis of the strength of America. We hope that in deciding not only on this amendment but on all the amendments the Members will have that in mind.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Taber amendment. The remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts, who has just concluded, I agree with entirely. He made an excellent speech, and I am proud of the Member from Massachusetts, even though he does not vote the way I do. But we are in a serious condition in this country, and we ought not to raise any money except for national defense. I cannot agree with the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Washington and the rest of the Members from the Western States who want little old New England to pay all the bills, and I am sympathetic with them, but why can they not, in a day like this when boys are being killed every minute, forget about some power proj-

ect? Let me tell you a little something about Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman, I believe, made the statement that New England and other sections of the East would be paying the bill, or paying for these power projects. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the power features of these projects must be repaid or amortized, together with the interest, normally over a 40- or 50-year period?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. They are all reimbursable projects, so that this is one item in the bill, among others, where Uncle Sam is making a very sound investment in the future of our country.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. TABER. That money does not come back into the Treasury, but just goes into the reclamation fund. As a practical matter, it never gets there.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. In the case of reclamation projects that is true, but Congress appropriates out of the reclamation fund, instead of out of the general receipts of the Treasury.

Mr. TABER. Only partly, I will say.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. POULSON. Also, they must bear in mind that we pay interest on that money which we appropriate, and the interest nowadays is not put back into the Treasury, as interest.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I did not want to get into the politics of Oregon and Washington and California or Arizona, where we built all these dams, and which are so productive to the welfare of the country. I am not worrying about that at all. They will take care of themselves in California. As a matter of fact, they have about eight more Representatives there than they used to have, because they give them a ham-and-egg program which does not suit the taste of the people of New England. We still eat salt codfish, and I guess we will keep on eating it if we keep on appropriating money like this.

All that the gentleman from New York is doing is to take the money for these power projects and use it for defense to save the lives of the people of this country and of the boys and girls who have to go to war.

Mr. Chairman, I was going to speak about Connecticut and Rhode Island and Massachusetts and about the REA. Of course, the gentleman from Mississippi is inclined to think that the TVA is the greatest thing in the world, but we do not have any rural electrification in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, and yet every farmer up there—at least 98 and some percent—has electric power today. And who made it possible? Private industry did.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. FURCOLO. Last night the gentleman and I attended a dinner where someone from New England spoke. He said that in New England when they pray they do not pray the Lord to give us some wealth. They just say, "Show us where it is and we will go and get it."

Mr. NICHOLSON. I want to thank the gentleman for saying that.

Mr. FURCOLO. This bill in effect does a great deal of that. It points out where the resources are.

Mr. RANKIN. I think he meant p-r-e-y.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] has expired.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I have shown what we could do on this REA in New England. I would like to have somebody get up here, whether he comes from California or where he comes from, and show me any commodity in the United States that has not risen in price except power. It is the one thing that these electric companies have furnished the people for less than they were getting 20 years ago.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The TVA brought it down.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Well, whoever brought it down or whatever happened, it is true.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I appreciate the talk the gentleman is making, but I call his attention to this fact: that the power business is a monopoly. Not only that, but it is a supervised and regulated monopoly.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Well, it is not a monopoly. The Public Utilities Commission in our State gave them the right to operate. They also reserved the right to say what they will pay for power and everything. The electric companies do not have a monopoly, because the gas companies are in competition with them. I do not know what they are in California. I am just talking about where this Nation was propagated and what we expect. We do not expect anybody to give us anything in Massachusetts. We go out and work for it, and we have had these public utilities companies and we have had the gas companies, and we run them, and we do not want the Government to run them for us. But you people out in the West take our money and then hate us.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes, I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I just wanted to point out to the gentleman that we in the West work also, and we work hard. We have built a tremendous State, but we cannot get away from the fact that the

people who operate the gas and electric companies are monopolies which are supervised and regulated by the Public Utilities Commission. No other business has that privilege, but they do have it, and it is probably for the public welfare.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Can you not tell the people back home that ten or fifteen million dollars from one of these appropriations might help the country in time of need, and you can get along without your electricity for a couple of years more? Can you not do that?

Mr. JOHNSON. Why, certainly.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Well, why do you not do it, then?

Mr. JOHNSON. I want to point this out to you, sir, that our Central Valley project is waiting for completion before it is worth anything. We have got \$440,000,000 in it. We want to build the ditches to carry the water into the other watersheds. Until we do that we cannot use any of it, because an injunction preventing the Reclamation Bureau from diverting water at Friant Dam until certain canals have been completed.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Why do you not wait until this war is over? Let us get one thing settled at a time, and take care of your problems, if you have got them. I do not think you have, because you will get the power dams and you will get the transmission lines, and anything else you want; only, let us wait until we finish up this war.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Does not the gentleman think that during this critical period, when we are trying to expand our industrial output, we ought to make every effort to increase our electric-power supply, whether private or public? In our part of the country some of the private utilities are building some dams. The basic problem is that we must expand our power output if we are going to expand industry. Expanding industry, in turn, is essential to the strength of America in peace and war.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mrs. Rosenberg, or whatever her name is, says we need just 3,500,000 recruits. We had 11,000,000, and we had all these places where they could build ships and everything else and we did it and we won. We can do the same thing now with the kind of construction we have got. That is my opinion.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Does the gentleman think that the industrial capacity we had during World War II is sufficient to defend America and the free world in a third world war?

Mr. NICHOLSON. That is a kind of a tough question. We can take care of ourselves, if that is what you mean, in the United States. But if we start taking care of England and France and Asia and India and everybody else, I will say we cannot do it. But I do not vote that way. You do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] has again expired.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard more mis-statements here today than I have heard on a bill for a long, long time. We all believe in economy at this time; certainly I do. What is proposed in this amendment is not economy; it is waste. You would think from the statements made here that you could win this war without the materials necessary to winning.

When we discuss the question of using electric power in any particular area, we should consider just what that area is producing, and what those products are producing. What are the Western States producing?

They are providing molybdenum ore which goes into the manufacture of steel to harden it. Do not forget that this is a war of steel—hard steel—in which we are now engaged. We have recently discovered uranium deposits in New Mexico. I assume uranium is needed since so much is being appropriated for atomic-energy projects. Without these minerals produced in the Western States, any war could drag on endlessly.

Operating mine equipment, operating the sawmills that cut our timber into usable form, operating the cotton gins that produce fiber for defense uses—all these things require electric power. They require power which cannot be obtained in that area from any source other than public development.

New Mexico is the land of wide open spaces. Distances are great out there, and water is scarce. We have used electricity to pump the precious water from the earth and grow more cotton, cotton that may provide the soldier with the extra cartridge belt or pack he so desperately needs.

We are using electricity in the mines to produce copper, and I do not think it is necessary to mention how vital copper is to our war effort. It is so vital that we recently offered Chile 3 cents a pound more than our domestic price.

I do not want to waste Federal funds; I do want to save American lives. That brings me to electricity's part in husbanding another vital defense resource—manpower. Rural electrification has made it possible for thousands and thousands of boys who formerly worked on the farms to find employment elsewhere. The work is being done by electricity. Perhaps some of the Members forget that 3 kilowatts can do the equivalent in work of more than 40 men.

The gentlemen from Massachusetts, as well as some other Members, have spoken here today about the Western States. Let me remind the gentleman that, in the case of my State, he and the rest of the people of the United States own 45 percent of it. That is the amount of land in New Mexico owned by the Federal Government. Similar situations prevail in the other Western States.

You probably wonder why we want this electric power? This is the reason. With many of the States in the West owned in greater part by the Federal Government, we are having a difficult time. We have the ranges that supply beef to the people of Massachusetts—and

we all love Massachusetts and the people who come from there. But this is not a love feast.

We want to get out of this war; yet this amendment will do more to stifle the war effort in the Western States than anything that has been offered. I sincerely hope it will be voted down.

(Mr. DEMPSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a rather strange discussion is going on in this country today, and that is whether or not the United States can survive—if you can imagine such a thing. It is difficult for me to understand how we could possibly get into a position politically, economically, geographically, or otherwise, where we have to discuss seriously the question, Can the United States as a government survive? That comes from almost every platform where the speaker is a student of world affairs. That is a danger signal.

Here is a headline that appears in today's paper: "Services want to hire 450,000 more civilians."

Have we gone completely crazy? We have the Grand Coulee Dam, the Hoover Dam, the Parker Dam, Coolidge Dam, and other dams—a dam here, a dam there, a dam somewhere else. I am not kicking about having those dams. I can argue that much water has been flowing through streams and going to waste for probably a million years. That potential power has not been captured. You can argue that you want to start this, that, and the other project in peacetime when there is no emergency, just like a family may start an additional room to the house when there is no emergency; but when the emergency arises you may have to forget the building of the new room and take the child to a hospital and pay the hospital bill, doing without the additional room for a while.

You may have to do without adding to some project where you have spent already \$450,000,000 or a billion dollars. I happen to be a member of a certain committee of this House and the other day we tabled for the time being a bill which calls for the direct expenditure of some \$788,000,000. Included in that bill was provision for another dam at Bridge Canyon on the Colorado River a few miles below the Grand Canyon National Park. We did not do that with pleasure. I told the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], who is sitting in front of me: "I do not believe you can get that bill through the Congress at the present time, and I do not want the bill to come up here and be turned down by a rather solid vote. I do not think this is the time to build that particular project."

Read carefully the President's message that he sent up here the other day on renewal of the Defense Act. Read his message of yesterday calling for an additional \$60,000,000,000 of defense money. Check your potential revenues and show me where you can finance all of these

things without going into additional deficit financing, without promoting more inflationary forces, and without further destroying the buying power of the savings of all the people of this country.

The President has asked us for economic stability, he asks for increased production, he says that without these two things we cannot win the war we are in. Of course you cannot. Economic stability means that the Congress of the United States has got to use some sense in making these appropriations. We have got to say to the people of this country that, "You are going to have to do without those things you can get along without at the present time until we finish this other task."

The people of my district know I will vote against an appropriation for my district as quickly as I will vote against an appropriation for any other district. I pledge my soul, body, and mind to cutting these appropriations if they can be cut and I want to repeat here again, if I get a chance I will vote to cut at least \$7,000,000,000 from the budget now before us. I am looking for those cuts to be applied to those things we can get along without. And any man who charges me with voting to fix it so the boys on the front cannot get the ammunition and stuff to fight with is just silly, that is all. He may make such charges all he wants to, let the newspapers make that charge all they want to, but it is not going to influence my vote and I shall vote in support of the pending amendment.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to show my personal gratitude and that of my own State for the deep interest which the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], has taken in the far West. I think he has been exceedingly fair and courageous because so few of the items contained in this bill touch his State and his district. He has traveled over the West. He knows the problems of the West, and he is not sectional. I appreciate, too, the leadership of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] which he has displayed on the floor of this House. I felt pretty bad the other day when we were discussing amendments to this bill and realized that we had not given the green light to the control of the beetle blight in the great forests of the intermountain West. If we would only realize what that means to the future, we would never have voted for that cut, because it means the eventual cutting of the water supply of the West. Yet, we sat here and did that the other day. We forget, too, about the halogeton weed, a perfectly vicious, fast-growing weed, that is so very difficult to eradicate and so difficult to distinguish from other weeds of the West, and how it has killed in one afternoon's time hundreds of sheep out West. Yet, we have to depend upon the West for so much of the meat we eat. We do things so carelessly—those amendments to cut should never have passed last week. Of course, we are interested in economy. I

am careful how I spend my own money. I come from a family that has lived in America since 1620; they have been careful spenders and they have been high taxpayers of this Nation. But, we must not, because we have prospered in the past, penny pinch the future for our great grandchildren. Some of the arguments on the floor remind me of when I was on the bench. I remember in court that the lawyers who waved the flag and talked about the women and the widows and the orphans never had much of a point to make. Now we could add to the flag and the widows and the women and the orphans, defense, because with the emotions of these subjects we can excuse and camouflage the arguments for false economy so often heard on the floor of this House. I do believe that it would help a great deal if the 435 Members of this House would sojourn in the West for a period of time. Go through that part of the Nation, travel it by automobile, and see the counties that are literally drying up; counties that previously have been productive. I wish, too, that you gentlemen, especially from the far East and the South, could see the great military installations that have been built in the West, such as we have in Utah between Ogden and Salt Lake City; installations that have brought in thousands of people who have increased our population 41 percent. We do not have enough water for culinary purposes for the homes of the civilians that work in those military establishments, and that water is so necessary. We have gone so far with certain projects and we must continue to build, for we need that water, let alone the power. There must be something for the boys of Korea to come home to. I am surprised that so often Members of Congress have thought of the West as a stepchild. Do you know, I believe that the western Representatives are as interested in Massachusetts and Georgia and Mississippi and Ohio as are the gentlemen representing those particular States.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. BOSONE. In just a moment. We surely realize now that the prosperity of one State is the prosperity of all States; that the prosperity of one section of this country is the prosperity of all sections of this country. In listening to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], you would get the idea that we could turn the floods on and off, have the sun shine today and disappear tomorrow. But man has no such power. We have to control floods and store and regulate water for the benefit of future economy and happiness, not only for the West but for the whole Nation. I am sorry my time is up.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendments close in 25 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MORRIS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, how much time will that give each of us?

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MORRIS. How much time would that give those who would like to speak?

Mr. BENDER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TABER. Would the gentleman make it 40 minutes, and let those Members each have 5 minutes?

Mr. FURCOLO. I will be glad to amend the request. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendments be closed in 40 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman mean the Taber amendment and all amendments thereto?

Mr. FURCOLO. All amendments to this paragraph.

Mr. TABER. Oh, I object to that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FURCOLO. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Taber amendment and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, why not have a motion to close debate on the Lovre amendment, and then some of the rest of us have amendments we would like to offer to this amendment. The way it is proposed now, that cuts out everybody else from offering an amendment.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the unanimous-consent request at this time.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in considering a bill of this kind I like to deal with facts and figures, and I am sure that you do also. It seems to me that if we are to carry on the proper kind of defense efforts for our great country we must also remain strong at home. I realize, as all of us do, that if there is any item in this bill where the figures are too high it ought to be reduced. None of us wants to waste money. None of us wants to spend money that is not necessary. But certainly no case has been made, in my judgment, to reduce the amount of this particular item. I believe that all of the weight of reason and logic is in favor of keeping it as it is.

I would like to give you some figures and facts for your consideration.

Under the President's proposed budget for 1952 there is envisioned the spending of \$71,600,000,000. The breakdown of the items is as follows: Military services, forty-one and four-tenths billions; international commitments, seven and five-tenths; interest, five and nine-tenths; veterans, four and nine-tenths; social security, welfare, and health, two and six-tenths billions; natural resources, two and five-tenths; transportation and commerce, one and seven-tenths; finance, commerce, and industry, one and five-tenths; agriculture, one and four-tenths; general government, one

and four-tenths; education, labor, and housing, eight-tenths billion.

Percentage-wise it is as follows: For military services, 58 percent; international obligations, 10 percent; interest on the national debt, and most of this occurred as a result of World War II, 8 percent; for veterans, 7 percent; for all other governmental purposes, 17 percent. In other words, about 83 percent of our entire budget is for past wars and present military activities.

Now I call your attention to this significant fact: As I said in the beginning, if we are to support our boys on the battlefields, if we are to support our defense effort, we must also remain strong at home and we need not kid ourselves; there just is not any place in the budget where it would be humanly possible to make any big percentage cut, anywhere. These are just cold figures and facts, and here they are before us. So let us not kid ourselves and let us not kid the American public as long as we are carrying on in these dark and dangerous days. The great military budget is such that it just is not possible to cut a big percentage of the whole budget; there just is not any chance anywhere to make any great big dent in it. That does not mean, of course, that we should not cut down any items that are improper; of course not. But let us not approach this matter with a lot of hope that we can make a great big percentage showing of cutting down on the budget, because it cannot be done; it cannot be done as long as we carry on with the tremendous program that we have before us from an international situation level, and I think that if we do start cutting we had better find a better place than this to start on, because when we start here we are cutting, in my judgment, at the very vitals not only of our domestic life but also of our defense efforts.

(Mr. MORRIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

(Mr. WERDEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. WERDEL addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I really feel that we are not cutting enough after reading the report of the subcommittee. On page 12 there is this statement:

Despite the full assurances given by the Secretary, a violation of comity between the Interior Department and the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress, has been committed by the Bureau of Reclamation. The committee hereby requests the Secretary to investigate all facts surrounding this situation and to report promptly his findings thereon together with a report on disciplinary action taken by him, if any, in the premises.

Well, now, if we understand what we read here, and I am sure this report was given to us for our guidance, we know that there is something wrong with this

whole operation. Under the circumstances we would make a great mistake in giving them too much to work with.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. In response to the gentleman's statement, I think that demonstrates that the committee has tried to do a fair, impartial, and honest job. I would like to say to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, that I was responsible for the language which he has just read. I believe in criticising the Bureau when they are not doing a good job, and that is exactly what the committee did with reference to the California-Oregon intertie. But, that does not mean that the other projects are not good and proper.

Mr. BENDER. I was glad to yield to the gentleman, though he took about 2 minutes of my time.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the gentleman.

I appreciate the statement which the gentleman has just made, but I listened to a previous statement he made in which he said that the Taber amendment, as amended, would hurt the war effort; that by cutting down this appropriation our boys would suffer and that through some hocus-pocus the war effort would be retarded.

Yesterday, in one of my home-town newspapers of Cleveland the Housing Administrator was complaining about defense houses deteriorating, in fact, going to pot. These houses were built during the last emergency. Now we find a shortage of housing in the Cleveland area due to the fact that these houses were not substantial enough to outlast the emergencies.

When is the new emergency to end, and when are we going to place responsibility for the continuation of the present emergency? When are we going to consider that which is responsible for the present emergency? Who made these tragic deals at Potsdam, Yalta, and Tehran? The leadership of the Democratic administration.

I was recently talking to a Cleveland man who was an officer on board ship. He told me that after the Second World War the boys were waiting to be mustered out, and they wanted to get an ice cream freezer or two on the ship. They wanted to enjoy the last few weeks on board that ship. But they did not get to first base. Then all of a sudden they pulled into port, and their ship was loaded to the gills with costly American supplies, with the finest instruments, radar equipment, and other instruments the names of which I am not conversant with. Carloads of technical equipment was loaded on board this ship. The crew wondered why. Then the crew

was ordered to go out to sea and land at another port, and waiting there was a Russian crew to whom this ship was turned over. These American boys had to train the Russian crew, this Communist crowd, in the operation of that ship and all equipment aboard.

We understand there were 686 ships turned over to the Russians by the United States Government, fully equipped, loaded with supplies, with all these things that we now complain there is a shortage of. Now the Roosevelt and Truman crowd complain about the shortages of vital material to conduct a war which this same leadership is responsible for.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KIRWAN. All I have to say is, "Vass you dere, Sharlie?"

Mr. BENDER. No; but I will give the gentleman the name of the gentleman who was there. I know the State Department is now endeavoring to get the Communists to keep the deal they had to turn back the 686 ships without cargo. "Vass you dere, Sharlie" or "Mike"?

I get sick and tired of all these appropriations that are asked for in the name of the war effort. Because of the bum deals our leadership made at Yalta, Potsdam, and Tehran, and subsequent deals they made with foreign governments, we find ourselves behind the eight ball.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. HUNTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this appropriation is less susceptible, logically and reasonably, to an across-the-board cut than any other, because it provides for a multitude of projects, all independent and separate. As my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] pointed out, if this cut of some \$10,000,000 is allowed, it is left entirely within the discretion of the Department of the Interior to decide where the cut will be made, and if precedent is followed in this case, the cuts will be made where it is politically most expedient.

I personally feel that the Central Valley project, in which I am vitally interested, and in which my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL], is also interested, is entirely meritorious. It is nearly complete. In this appropriation a certain amount of money is allocated for completion of the Delta cross-channel, and the completion of the Tracy pumping plant which brings water up from the channel from the Sacramento River, into the Delta-Mendota canal and thence into the Delta-Mendota pool to replace water from the San Joaquin River, which is diverted from its natural course.

Speaking of urgency, and speaking of the possibility of deferment, I do not believe this particular project can be deferred any longer. The water is needed now. The San Joaquin Valley at the present time is suffering from one

of four of the worst droughts in 50 years. The water table is going down throughout the valley. Some of the wells on the west side go down 2,000 feet. The cost of such wells runs up to \$45,000.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it not also a fact that there is now an injunction against the Reclamation Bureau using the water until certain canals that you mention have been completed?

Mr. HUNTER. The water which is intended to go down to the southern part of the valley from the San Joaquin River cannot be diverted legally until it is replaced by water from the Sacramento. That is not possible until the basic project is complete. In this appropriation there is money for the switchyard at Tracy, for the Shasta-Tracy westside line, also money for the completion of the main canals and for laterals, extending from these main canals. The water is of no use in the canal unless the laterals are built.

Food and fiber are as necessary to the defense of our country as guns. Cotton, for example, is not only needed for clothing but also for explosives. Cotton is a critical material. It is in short supply. Much of the Nation's cotton is being grown in the San Joaquin Valley. This cannot be done without water. Completion of the Central Valley project of California is therefore necessary at the earliest possible date. To delay its completion would be false economy indeed.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

(Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, there are two or three things I wanted to touch on in my limited time. The gentlewoman from Utah spoke a moment ago about serious cuts which were unwise. I was handed this picture which I show you now of many dead sheep on the desert. The gentlewoman spoke of a dangerous weed that has spread over her part of the West. She did not elaborate on its nature but she said that it was destructive to the sheep industry out there. I find this picture, taken from a well-known national magazine, a pictorial magazine, shows that this sheep-killing weed covers an area larger than the State of Nevada. Here is a map showing that area covered by it. It touches on five States, mainly covering the States of Nevada and Utah.

Speaking of appropriating money for national defense, I want to remind the Committee that wool is one of the essentials of the defense program. Must we get most of our wool from Australia? We permit our wool industry and our mutton industry of America to be destroyed, and that is what I feel we have tended to do by an earlier cut in an appropriation which has already passed.

I recall that my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], a little earlier today made mention of a project which I have been sponsoring, the central Arizona project. I want

what he said to be properly understood. As ranking minority member on that committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] did say to me, "This is not the time for considering such a project, costing admittedly \$788,000,000." He said to the committee, "The project has been indefinitely postponed." Now, I want to set the record straight.

That project involves many elements; some needed now; others can wait. It does involve the building of a power dam on the Colorado River at the Bridge Canyon site and national defense calls for that now. It also involves a reclamation project, which the terms of the bill postpone until after the emergency. There has been fierce opposition to part of that project, and the fiercest opponents to the project want the power dam built on the Colorado River at the Bridge Canyon site; and, in addition to that, they would build some other dams, but no water diverted in Arizona.

They place the building of dams on the ground that power is needed in the Pacific Southwest, and it certainly is. Heaven only knows what we would have done during the Second World War if we had not had the power from Hoover Dam, from Grand Coulee, from the Tennessee Valley, and some of these other plants. We do not know but that we are headed into a third world war. If we do get into a third world war we will need more and more power.

This amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] strikes at the very production of power, or at least its transmission. That is why I object so seriously to the Taber amendment, but especially to the part of it which strikes out the transmission lines. It is worse than useless to build dams and power plants if we do not have transmission lines. The building of transmission lines is as much a part of the defense program as the building of airplanes and other implements of war; just as much as the building of arsenals for the production of guns, powder, and tanks. I ask you members of the committee to think seriously what is truly involved in defense.

However, I wanted to make that point clear, that my bill, the central Arizona project, of which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] spoke, does provide that no part of the reclamation shall be constructed so long as this emergency exists. We must take that proposition as my bill actually provides it, only that part of the bill, about half the total cost involved, may be built in power dams, transmission lines, and power plants while the war is on. Therefore proper consideration of the central Arizona project, involving \$788,000,000, did not necessarily involve postponement of building the dam and the power plants for defense purposes, but by its own terms did delay reclamation and that part for nondefense purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I feel that this amendment would be a mistake. It seeks to cut down the ability we have as a government to make disposition of the great pools of hydroelectric power we are developing throughout the country. Those of you who have followed our rearmament program know that one of the great deficiencies we are facing now is hydroelectric power. That is true in almost every area. In the great Columbia River Basin where 40 percent of the potential hydroelectric power of the Nation lies, only 10 percent of it is developed. This cut in the appropriation is an attempt to take away the wheeling of the power in these projects to the points where it can be utilized and put into production.

In the United States we have immense natural deposits which are the salvation of this country. For instance, the great iron ore deposits which we have had. For 2 months my Committee on Public Works has been wrestling with that program, to find sufficient deposits of iron ore so that the great iron ore industry may not collapse in this country. We are asked to appropriate over \$500,000,000 in one project now before our Committee on Public Works to make it possible to bring iron ore from Labrador and Quebec. Do you realize that this great natural resource of hydroelectric power is not expendable like iron ore or like coal or like natural gas or like oil?

All of these great natural resources are expendable and we find a dearth in many of them at the present time, but water, hydroelectric power, is one of the greatest resources of the Nation because it goes on forever and forever. As long as water falls and the sun shines, we will have hydro power; and when we once establish one of these great generating facilities like Grand Coulee, or Bonneville, or Hoover Dam, or Shasta, it is an asset in the hands of the people which is almost interminable for centuries without much additional cost. Do you realize that every dollar that is expended in most of these great plants comes back to the Federal Government in a short period of, say, 50 years? Not only the original investment, but with interest.

The other night I observed on the television a news item of the construction of a huge dam in Austria. It was an immense affair, way up in the mountains of Austria. The news broadcaster said it was the greatest project in Austria and was one of 17. Do you know who was paying for it? Uncle Sam.

Do you realize we are spending billions of dollars throughout the world under ECA and the Marshall plan? We are building hydroelectric plants, we are building railroads or digging canals or making docks; we are doing everything almost on earth to advance the economy of the nations around the world and yet here in America we have to plead, and plead, and plead to get even a minimum of expenditures to carry on the development of our own natural resources or for their conservation or for their full utilization. I am sure you realize as has

often been said that if we win this war as we won the last, it will depend upon production; and we cannot have production unless we have hydroelectric power. One-third of the aluminum that went into World War II came from the Columbia River area due to the hydroelectric power which was developed on the great Columbia River and its tributaries.

These cuts that were heretofore agreed to by this committee, in the Bonneville Power Administration, in my judgment, were a great mistake. In the extension of my remarks I shall have something to say with reference to this. If there is one place where we should not seek economy, where cuts would be false economy, it is in the development of our natural resources for their full utilization and their conservation, especially great resources such as hydroelectric power which goes on and on forever and is not exhaustible. We must have hydroelectric power if we are to have full production and complete our rearmament program and provide for our national defense.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely believe that this Committee made a grievous error in reducing the appropriation in this bill for the Bonneville Power Administration. This agency is one of the most important governmental agencies contributing not only to a healthful peacetime economy, but is of vital importance in the war effort. I want to discuss its contribution to our war efforts as well as our peacetime economy.

Electric power is a prime necessity in carrying out our rearmament program. During World War II approximately a third of the aluminum needed in airplane construction came from the Columbia River area and was supplied by Bonneville power. This operation has the endorsement of private utilities in that area dealing with electric power. The activities of the agency have been carried out with so much efficiency and farsighted planning that it has not only increased its output from year to year but has been able to produce power far beyond the rated capacity of the generators under its control and has marketed the power successfully, resulting in bringing into the Treasury uninterrupted revenues. In fact, Bonneville is far ahead in its amortization schedule returning to the Federal Government its investment with interest.

As was recently reported in the Oregon Voter in its issue of April 14, 1951, energy sales of the Bonneville Power Administration in 1950 amounted to 13,932,372,336 kilowatt-hours. This was 12.7 percent more than the 12,361,921,000 kilowatt-hours of sales reported for 1949. Revenues from the sales amounted to \$33,357,855. This was 15.3 percent more than the \$28,926,133 booked in 1949.

Average revenue per kilowatt-hour sold was 2.39 mills as against 2.34 mills the year before and a top over-all return of 3.04 mills for the calendar year 1945. Electric energy generated was 13.2 percent greater in amount than was turned out from the two big dams in 1949. The total was 15,160,957,200 kilowatt-hours. Grand Coulee was credited with producing 11,419,277,200 and Bonneville

with 3,741,680,000 kilowatt-hours. The Federal system bought 100,285,660 kilowatt-hours from other utility systems. All figures constituted new high percentage records—output, sales, and revenues.

Bonneville sale and revenues

Year	Kilowatt-hours sold	Revenues
1941 and prior years.....	2,125,231,000	\$4,600,658
1942.....	3,882,769,000	8,877,687
1943.....	6,921,770,000	16,346,676
1944.....	8,984,515,000	22,354,054
1945.....	7,436,359,000	22,626,245
1946.....	6,397,874,000	16,123,066
1947.....	9,277,473,000	22,050,897
1948.....	11,411,832,000	26,253,188
1949.....	12,361,921,000	28,926,133
1950.....	13,932,372,000	33,347,855
Total.....	82,732,116,000	201,406,459

Publicly owned agencies last year took 23.1 percent more power than in 1949—3,017,601,000 kilowatt hours against 2,451,093,000. Public utility districts increased their purchases of the Federal energy 37.4 percent in taking 1,885,195,000 kilowatt-hours. Cooperatives increased their purchases 24 percent in taking 294,541,000 kilowatt-hours. The number of customer public utility districts remained unchanged at 24, while the number of cooperatives increased from 29 to 31. The Seattle and Tacoma municipal systems bought 606,213,000 kilowatt-hours, all but a tiny amount being firm power. This marked an increase of 2 percent for the year.

Private-management utilities bought 2,819,896,000 kilowatt-hours, some of this on interruptible basis, and got 580,710,000 kilowatt-hours of nonfirm power, or a total of 3,490,606,000 kilowatt-hours. Their firm-power purchases marked a decrease of 3 percent.

The aluminum industry bought almost as much Bonneville power as did all power utilities lumped together. It took 6,221,502,000 kilowatt-hours, an increase of 10.2 percent. Other industrial plants took 1,259,967,000 kilowatt-hours, an increase of 45 percent. Bonneville thus sold substantially more power direct to industries than to power systems, the grand total of these sales being 7,481,469,000 kilowatt-hours. The number of aluminum customers remained at 6, while the number of other industrial customers dropped from 15 to 13.

The lowest rate, as would be surmised, was enjoyed by the aluminum companies. It averaged 2.07 mills, duplicating the 1949 average. Private-management utilities paid an average of 2.39 mills per kilowatt-hour for firm power against 2.28 mills in 1949. Average rate charged publicly owned systems was 3.01 mills against 2.87 mills. Public Utility Districts had an average rate of 2.97 mills against 3.02 mills. Cooperatives paid an average of 3.43 mills against 3.40 mills. The Seattle-Tacoma municipal systems paid an average of 2.75 mills for firm power against 2.14 mills, 1949 average. Fourteen smaller municipal systems paid an average of 3.56 mills as against 3.44 mills.

I want again to bring to the attention of the Committee the necessity for allowing the full appropriation for the

Bonneville Power Administration as reported by the Appropriations Committee. The committee itself made a substantial reduction in the budget estimate and to make a further reduction will not only cripple the operations of this important agency but will result in heavy financial loss to the Government itself in the curtailment of additional revenues from the sale of electric power.

The power situation in the Pacific Northwest continues critical, as has been the case for the past few years. On a normal peacetime basis our best expectations were that it would be 1958 before adequate supplies of firm power would be available to the Pacific Northwest region. That situation has now changed drastically by the imposition of heavy new requirements for power due to the emergency situation that is now facing our country. In times of national emergency every area is called upon to assume its share of the burden of providing for the security of the country as a whole. The Pacific Northwest is assuming its share of this burden but, in doing so, is making our power situation even more critical unless adequate measures are taken immediately to insure that new power supplies will be made available within the shortest possible time.

During the past 6 months the Bonneville Power Administration has committed several hundred thousand kilowatts of additional power solely for defense loads, principally for aluminum, phosphorus, and magnesium. Much of this commitment has been on an interruptible basis and will continue to be on this basis until new power is available from the Hungry Horse project which will come into operation in late 1952. Other projects are under construction to come into operation from 1953 to 1956, but there is need for additional power supplies to be brought into being in the interim period before power can be obtained from these large hydroelectric projects now under construction.

The Bonneville Power Administration has been studying ways and means to supply these additional power loads, these means including such expedients as steam plants strategically located, regional interconnections, and cooperation with others for the construction of projects by non-Federal agencies. In the longer range program, several new projects are needed. In the President's budget this year he has recommended that Hells Canyon, Ice Harbor, and The Dalles projects be gotten under way as early as possible in order to provide a balanced program to support the national defense needs, the regional economy, and the essential civilian requirements.

Along with these plans must go an adequate program of transmission line and substation construction in order that the power made available can be delivered where it is needed and when it is needed. The Bonneville program for fiscal year 1952 is planned to provide transmission facilities of sufficient capacity to deliver 1,300,000 kilowatts of new generation that will become available by 1954. In addition, it has become apparent that the system must be strengthened if the heavy power deliv-

eries required by recent commitments are to be met with any degree of reliability. These objectives have been considered in the formulation of the program that has been presented. However, there is every indication that additional acceleration will be needed, as well as other transmission facilities to provide for the movement of new power generated and, if this situation develops, without a doubt the Administration will need additional funds in order that all power commitments can be met.

Since the program as presented is of such great importance to the region, I urge that these requests be granted exactly as outlined. The program actually contains very few projects that are directly in my congressional district. However, it contains many main grid facilities without which my area would be in dire straits from the standpoint of power supply. Facilities in my area and of direct concern to my area are as follows:

BUDGET ITEM 1-1, GRAND COULEE - MIDWAY
NO. 3—BUDGET ITEM 1-2, GRAND COULEE -
MIDWAY NO. 2, CONDUCTOR CHANGE

The first item is an additional circuit; the second is a change on an existing circuit to provide for greater capacity. These facilities are absolutely necessary to transmit Grand Coulee power to the Portland area and to the coastal area of Oregon. They are extremely necessary because the loss of any one circuit between these two points would result in a system-wide disturbance such as has occurred in the Pacific Northwest a number of times within the past few years.

BUDGET ITEM 1-3, GRAND COULEE - COLUMBIA
NO. 3—BUDGET ITEM 1-4, GRAND COULEE -
COLUMBIA NO. 4

Funds requested for these items are to continue the construction of these vitally needed lines necessary to transmit power to the coastal area of Washington below Olympia and to the Portland, Oreg., area. By supporting power supply to the entire coastal area of Oregon and Washington, greater system stability is achieved and greater power service reliability. The No. 4 line will eventually connect with the Columbia-Olympia line and be operated at 287,000 volts to provide needed power capacity.

BUDGET ITEM 1-6, COLUMBIA-OLYMPIA

This circuit will provide needed capacity to the coastal Washington area, and, since power flow in part is south from Olympia toward Portland, Oreg., this capacity will insure power service to my district. This circuit alone will carry over 225,000 kilowatts by December 1954.

BUDGET ITEM 1-11, McNARY-BIG EDDY-TROUTDALE—BUDGET ITEM 1-12, McNARY-BIG EDDY-ROSS

These circuits will be 230,000-volt transmission lines that will be needed to transmit power to be generated at McNary Dam into the Vancouver-Portland-Troutdale area. These lines will be particularly important from the standpoint of national defense as well as to the essential civilian economy. One line has been previously authorized; the other is a new line for which authorization is requested this year.

BUDGET ITEM 1-17, ROSS-ST. JOHNS CONVERSION

Funds requested are to continue the conversion of the two existing lines between Vancouver, Wash., and St. Johns substation in Portland from 115,000-volt to 230,000-volt operation in order to provide badly needed transmission capacity between these two points. Also included is the installation of two 150,000-kilo-volt-ampere transformer banks. It will not only support power service in the Portland area but in the area south of Portland.

The facilities included in this program are absolutely necessary as a part of the main grid system. The lines to integrate the Hungry Horse plant with the main Bonneville system are equally necessary. Also of extreme importance are the lines already authorized for transmitting McNary power to the coastal area of Oregon and the line known as the southwest Oregon loop service line that will be used to provide power to southwest Oregon.

As I mentioned previously, the entire Bonneville program is sound and should be permitted to go forward at the fastest possible pace. Nearly 90 percent of the funds requested for fiscal year 1952 are for previously authorized facilities, only about 10 percent being requested to start new lines and these are planned only where absolutely necessary. As in previous years, something more than 80 percent of the funds requested are for main grid transmission facilities, with only a minor part of the request being for customer service facilities.

I urge support for the operations and maintenance requests of the Bonneville Power Administration. They are requesting \$5,500,000 for this purpose this year, which is only a 10-percent increase over the amount allowed them for this purpose in fiscal year 1951. This increase in funds is necessary because of the increase in facilities to be manned, maintained, and operated. It is in line with the increased business responsibilities of the Administration which result from such expansion, and I earnestly urge that they be allowed the full amount so that the grade of service for which the people in the Northwest area pay is afforded them. The Federal Government is fully compensated by the increased revenues from the sale of power. I think that not enough emphasis has been placed on this latter point. The users of power pay for a high standard of service which should be no less than the normal utility standards throughout the country. It is the aim of the Bonneville Power Administration to provide service in accordance with these standards, but they cannot do so unless sufficient funds are granted them. I am also aware that on a unit basis, operation and maintenance expenditures made by the Bonneville Power Administration are no greater, and in most cases less than corresponding expenditures by private utilities throughout the country. I should like to point out that the fact that the Bonneville power rate has been maintained at the same level for the past 10 years, even in the face of drastically increased labor and material costs, is a tribute to the BPA manage-

ment and clearly demonstrates their ability to wisely manage funds appropriated to them in whatever amount.

Mr. Chairman, there recently appeared in the public press a news item that an embargo was being considered on the construction of new defense plants in the Pacific Northwest because of the shortage of electric power. Such a proposal is without merit and its mere suggestion works a hardship on an area of our country which possesses the greatest pool of hydroelectric power of any locality in the Nation and which has shown the greatest advance in development in water and power resources in the last decade.

While it is true there is a growing need for electric power in the Pacific Northwest, the same condition exists throughout the Nation and there is more potential hydroelectric power in the process of development in that area than in any other area in the country. Furthermore, by the judicious handling of existing power and the utilization of interruptible power for proper allocations, together with the power coming into production from new generators, many new defense plants can receive the power needed for operation. The power shortage is not nearly as critical in this area as in other regions of the Nation. The problem can be met, in addition to the steps I have enumerated, by speeding up the construction for their full utilization of the existing power projects in the area.

The report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission recently released states:

The Columbia River is potentially one of the greatest power-producing streams in the world. Although existing hydroelectric developments in the basin account for about a sixth of the developed hydroelectric power capacity of the United States, they utilize less than 10 percent of the potential water power of the basin.

There are existing in the Columbia River Basin eight Federal hydroelectric plants having a total installed generating capacity of 1,969,000 kilowatts, with Bonneville and Grand Coulee providing the bulk of the capacity, and 41 existing non-Federal hydroelectric utility plants of 2,500 kilowatts or more installed capacity having an aggregate installation of 931,000 kilowatts. Federal plants, therefore, account for two-thirds of the total hydroelectric capacity of 2,900,000 kilowatts in the watershed. The average annual output of the Federal plants, amounting to 13,782,000,000 kilowatt-hours, accounts for 70 percent of the total annual hydroelectric generation of 19,900,000,000 kilowatt-hours in the basin. Not included in the above totals are a large number of smaller electric utility plants and electric plants of industrial establishments, which grouped together have a total installed capacity of some 65,000 kilowatts with average annual generation of 300,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

The total active conservation storage capacity of existing hydroelectric developments in the Columbia River Basin amounts to approximately 9,500,000 acre-feet. The storage capacity in the Grand Coulee Reservoir accounts for more than one-half of this total. In addition to the storage capacities listed in table 1, there are 25 reservoirs providing conservation storage capacity which are not listed because power is not developed

at the reservoir sites. These projects provide approximately 5,000,000 acre-feet of active storage capacity, although this storage has been developed primarily in connection with irrigation. When existing storage capacities are compared with the large average runoff in the basin, amounting to about 180,000,000 acre-feet annually during the 50 years 1897-1946, it is apparent that extensive amounts of additional regulatory storage capacity are necessary for the adequate development and utilization of the water resources of the basin.

Hydroelectric power facilities in the Columbia River Basin, including both Federal and non-Federal plants, are operated as part of the region-wide Northwest Power Pool which covers substantially the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Utah, and western Montana. Included in this pool are the generating facilities, both steam and hydro, of the major electric utilities in the region, the Bonneville and Grand Coulee plants of the Federal Government, and the transmission network of the Bonneville Power Administration. Participation in the pool is on a voluntary basis. The pool provides system operation which is practically equivalent to that to be expected under one ownership.

The Department of the Interior, which markets the power from the Bonneville and Grand Coulee plants and will market the power from future Federal projects in the region, provides the transmission network permitting efficient pool operation. The Department's transmission network consists of 4,050 circuit miles of line and 109 substations with 3,458,000 kilovolt-amperes of transformer capacity. Power produced is transmitted over the system to principal load centers in the region and sold at wholesale to private and public power distributors, large power-using industries, and to military, naval, atomic energy, and other Federal establishments.

The combined peaking capacity of the pool now totals about 4,500,000 kilowatts, of which approximately 90 percent is provided by hydroelectric plants. Recent estimates of loads indicate that a system demand of between 4,500,000 and 5,000,000 kilowatts may be expected by the end of 1950, and a peak demand of from 5,500,000 to 6,000,000 kilowatts is to be anticipated by December 1952. It is evident, therefore, that the need for additional generating capacity in the region is urgent, even though additions for emergency national-defense needs have not been included in the estimate.

In addition to the Department of Interior and Corps of Engineers' activities, the Federal Government is active in the basin through the Rural Electrification Administration. Ninety-seven percent of the farms in the Columbia Basin have electricity, as compared to 33 percent in 1935. The Rural Electrification Administration has been directly responsible for a third of this increase and has indirectly brought about the electrification of an additional 65,000 farms by its stimulating effect on the programs of the basin power companies. The REA has loaned \$50,000,000 for the construction of 22,000 miles of distribution lines to serve 52,000 rural consumers.

The electric-power potential of the Columbia River and its tributaries comprises 40 percent of the United States' potential capacity. The river has developable storage capacity of about 100,000,000 acre-feet. The President's Commission reports that 34,000,000-kilowatt capacity of electric generation can be developed in the American part of the Columbia River Basin and has pointed out that less than 10 percent of this has been developed. It is estimated that there are 387 additional sites capa-

ble of development in the basin with an installed capacity of approximately 31,000,000 kilowatts, and average annual generation of 149,000,000 kilowatt-hours. Projects are in construction, or authorized for construction, on 21 of these sites, for 9,900,000 kilowatts installed capacity, and 56,000,000 kilowatt-hours generation annually. There remain accordingly about 21,000,000 kilowatts capacity for future possible developments, with estimated annual generation of 93,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually. These potential developments are widely scattered over the basin, although a large part of the potential capacity is on the main stem of the Columbia and the lower courses of the main tributaries.

Potential hydroelectric power in Columbia River Basin

	Number of projects	Installed capacity	Average annual generation
EXISTING HYDROELECTRIC POWER			
Constructed projects:		Kilowatts	1,000 kilowatt-hours
Federal.....	8	1,969,387	13,783,000
Non-Federal.....	41	930,720	6,134,000
Total.....	49	2,900,107	19,917,000
UNDEVELOPED HYDROELECTRIC POWER			
Projects under construction:			
Federal.....	7	2,503,500	16,993,000
Non-Federal.....	0		
Total.....	7	2,503,500	16,993,000
Authorized projects:			
Federal.....	14	7,470,100	39,283,000
Other projects.....	365	21,395,900	92,749,000
Total undeveloped power.....	387	31,369,500	149,025,000
Total potential power.....	436	34,269,607	168,942,000

With the new generators soon to be installed in the Grand Coulee project and with the completion of projects now under construction, such as McNary Dam, Hungry Horse, Chief Joseph, and Albeni Falls, a heavy increase of hydroelectric power will be available in the area. Some of this power will come into production in ample time to be used by new defense plants located in the area.

Three additional projects on the Columbia River which have been authorized would supply 1,700,000 kilowatts more for national defense. These are the Ice Harbor project with an installed capacity of 260,000 kilowatts, Hell's Canyon with a capacity of 900,000 kilowatts, and the Dalles project with installed capacity of 980,000 kilowatts. These three dams alone would produce approximately 40 percent of the kilowatts now required by the national defense program.

Designs and site investigations are complete for both the Ice Harbor and Hell's Canyon projects and are well along toward completion in the Dalles project. If construction should start now generation would begin at Ice Harbor in December 1955, and at Hell's Canyon and The Dalles in 1956.

It should not be overlooked that all of these hydroelectric plants are self-liquidating and the funds received from the sale of electric energy will take care of

maintenance and upkeep and retire the investment with interest within a reasonable amortization period while supplying hydroelectric power at the most reasonable rates existing anywhere in the United States. Water power is not expendable. This vast pool of hydroelectric energy in the Columbia River Basin will continue to serve mankind as long as water falls and rivers run.

After the cost of the plants has been amortized the consuming public will reap the benefit of even lower hydroelectric rates. It would require 7,500,000 tons of coal per year to produce the 1,700,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric energy which would be made available by the construction of the Ice Harbor, Hells Canyon, and the Dalles projects. It would take 25,000,000 barrels of oil to produce the same number of kilowatts. While we do not have gas and oil in the Pacific Northwest we do have this invaluable water resource and potential hydroelectric power which will continue to serve the people of the Northwest and the Nation as long as the Nation exists. It certainly would be unwise not to develop this great resource and make the hydroelectric power available to cities, industries, and farmers demanding it. This is particularly true by reason of the fact that ultimately Uncle Sam will be repaid dollar for dollar for the investments, while the country is enjoying the benefits of cheap hydroelectric energy. The importance to the Nation of the development of Columbia River power is apparent when we consider that it has a potential of 34,000,000 kilowatts whereas St. Lawrence on the American side has only a little more than a million kilowatts and the Colorado some 5,000,000 kilowatts.

In years past I have addressed this House many times with regard to the critical situation that has existed in the Pacific Northwest from the standpoint of power supply. Ever since the end of the war extraordinary measures have been necessary in order that the basic requirements of the region could be served, and this condition has resulted, in a great measure, in industrial stagnation in the Pacific Northwest because industries could not expand nor could new industries establish in the region because they could not be promised a continuous supply of electric power so necessary in any kind of endeavor. Each year the Federal agencies responsible for construction and operation of power plants and the transmission system have presented a program of project construction designed to alleviate this condition at some distant future date. Each year the date of this relief became further away. Last year it was pointed out that based on normal peacetime progress, the region would not have sufficient supplies of firm power until 1958, and this prediction was based upon a proposed program of projects to be constructed, some of which were under construction, some of which were authorized, and some of which were only proposed. However the date of this relief has always become further away, primarily because the program so carefully prepared was not followed due either to lack of authorizations or lack of appropriations and by reason of in-

creased requirements for power to meet the needs of the area.

During the past year a new crisis has come upon us—an emergency of almost unprecedented proportions. America's great strength in such an emergency lies in her industrial potential, the key to which is electric power. The requirements of the defense effort are nationally shared by every region in the United States, and thus a major new requirement of electric power has been superimposed on the previous situation that faced the Northwest region.

At the start of World War II, the Northwest had great potential. Both Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams had been completed and it remained only to install the generating machinery to provide great new quantities of electric power so badly needed in the war effort. The situation is completely different in the present emergency. While several projects are under construction, there is nothing available whereby immediate production of new power can be attained. During the past year three generators were installed at the Grand Coulee plant, and these are the only significant increases that have been made in power supply. Three additional generators can be installed at this plant, and it is proposed to do this during the current calendar year. However, until new storage facilities are available, these last three units will add little to the energy supply, being valuable for peaking purposes only. As against this meager new power supply, additional major demands for power for defense have been made on the region.

Our area has not shirked these demands, but rather much work has been done to explore ways and means by which the Pacific Northwest can contribute its part of the national industrial expansion that is necessary. The Pacific Northwest can contribute its part in this expansion if development of its hydroelectric power resources moves forward rapidly, and a program has been prepared looking to this rapid development of power resources. At the present time there are six power projects under construction in the Pacific Northwest. These are the McNary, Chief Joseph, Albeni Falls, Hungry Horse, Detroit, and Lookout Point projects. It is planned to accelerate construction of these projects to the greatest extent feasible. The first of these, the Hungry Horse project, will begin operations in the late fall of 1952; water storage but no generation will be available about the same time at Albeni Falls. McNary and Detroit will begin operations about a year later, followed in 1954 by the Lookout Point project, and Chief Joseph will begin operations, according to present plans, in 1955. Several of these projects will be major power producers, and all of the plants will provide substantial additions to power supplies in the area.

Other producers who work in harmony with the Federal Government have also indicated plans for the construction of additional new power plants in the area. The city of Seattle, the city of Tacoma, the Chelan County PUD, the Pend Oreille County PUD, the California-Oregon

Power Co., the Idaho Power Co., the Portland General Electric Co., the Washington Water Power Co., and the Pacific Power & Light Co. all have either under construction or plans for construction various power projects that will increase power supplies by approximately 1,000,000 kilowatts by 1953. All of this power will be absorbed as rapidly as it can be brought into production, and will still leave a major deficit unless the program as now proposed by the Federal agencies is followed.

There are still some further steps that can be taken and should be taken to bolster power supply and particularly to provide the utmost use of power resources of the region.

One expedient which is being studied and would have particular value is the installation of several steam plants strategically located in the Pacific Northwest. The particular virtue of these steam plants is that they can be constructed in a substantially shorter time than major hydroelectric projects; they can be placed at certain points on the systems that would result in decreased power losses and transmission costs. These plants would be used to firm up power now being sold on an interruptible basis, which means that the supply of such power is discontinued to a customer at any time when water supplies are too low for such power to be generated. It is significant that at the present time the Bonneville Power Administration has committed over 300,000 kilowatts of such interruptible power to industries alone, and this figure will increase within the following 2 years to approximately 600,000 kilowatts. It is further significant that all of the power supply to private utilities in my area this year from the Federal system is on an interruptible basis. That situation is dangerous because it means definite curtailment of power use both to industry and other customers if water supplies should become critical in any year. During the current winter season the good Lord has blessed us with ample water supply, so that no difficulty was encountered in supplying all such interruptible loads during this winter, and it is not now anticipated that any such difficulty will occur. If a means were provided to convert this interruptible power to firm power it certainly would be a desirable step to be taken. The use of steam plants for this purpose, even in my area with its great hydroelectric potentials, has its place because the combination of additional generated power with interruptible hydro power can still result in low-cost power and permits the further use of power that might otherwise be wasted. Many plants cannot contract for power on an interruptible basis because their processes are such that they may not be interrupted. This plan should certainly receive further concentrated consideration.

As power supplies are increased, it is also essential that sufficient transmission capacity be provided to transmit this power to the places where it can be used. The funds stricken from the bill we are considering are needed for that purpose. The Bonneville Power

Administration's system, which has long served as the backbone grid of the whole Northwest region, is being extended and strengthened by the addition of 10 major high voltage facilities, either under construction or already approved, to be in service by December 1953. The program presented by the Bonneville Power Administration for fiscal year 1952 is in general designed to further this requirement. They have presented a budget for fiscal year 1952 of \$69,500,000 for construction, most of which is to move forward the construction of these major circuits already approved. A minor part of it is for the initiation of construction of several other facilities that will be needed no later than 1954 to transmit the power from projects that I have mentioned herein. The Bonneville officials have told me that this is a minimum program in this time of national defense and that further funds may be required to accelerate the construction of these transmission facilities in line with accelerations planned for power producing projects to meet defense program commitments. The budget also provides for some customer service facilities vitally needed for defense industries or essential civilian requirements.

I would like to say a further word about the power requirements of the region based on average year needs and for defense industries. Loads are increasing not only by reason of defense industries but by reason of increased civilian needs resulting from the defense program and the continued high level of economic activity. It is significant that the western group of the Pacific Northwest Power Pool, exclusive of the Bonneville Power Administration, now estimates that their energy requirements for each of the next 3 years will be about 6 percent greater than they estimated last May. Loads of the private utilities and public agency distributors increased from an average of 800,000 kilowatts in 1940-41 to 2,250,000 kilowatts in 1950-51 and they are increasing substantially each year. The population of the Pacific Northwest reached 4,670,000 in 1950, an increase of 33 percent since 1940 compared with a growth in the Nation of 14 percent. In 1950 the average residential and farm consumer purchased more than three times the electric energy that he purchased in 1940, the corresponding increase in the United States being less than twice. It is estimated that the loads of the distributors will increase from the 2,250,000 kilowatts previously mentioned, to 3,150,000 in 1954-55, and to more than 4,000,000 by 1958. These increases do not include the major industrial increases due to the defense program which are expanding much more rapidly. It is estimated that industrial loads will more than double within the next 3 to 4 years, due primarily to defense requirements.

In concluding, I would like to again point out that it is absolutely essential that the program for new power supplies outlined herein and as recommended by the President for the Pacific Northwest region be implemented and gotten under way at the earliest possible time, not only for the well being of the Pacific

Northwest region and its people but primarily for the well being of the entire country. I must also point out, as I have before, that this entire program is on a self-sustaining basis. Not one cent of investment in this program will be lost, but will be completely repaid with interest, not to mention the great increase in the national revenue that results from such a program aside from receipts from power sales. During the last war, millions of dollars were spent for industrial expansion, which represented a complete loss to the country because such plants were constructed on an emergency basis without regard to their future value. This was not the case in the Pacific Northwest, and it will not be now. The program as presented is one based on a solid economic foundation, in addition to being planned to meet the urgent needs of the country.

As I said in the opening of these remarks I most sincerely believe that it is a mistake for this committee to reduce the appropriation recommended by the Appropriation Committee for carrying on the activities of the Bonneville Power Administration. The reduction made in the Committee of the Whole should be restored by the House when the bill is returned to it for action and if this is not done, I feel sure the Senate in its wisdom will restore the full amount recommended by the budget.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be read again.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Mr. LOVRE moves that the pending Taber amendment be amended as follows: Strike out that portion of the language which reads "and the cut below the budget estimate shall be deducted from the estimates for power and transmission lines."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were ayes 75, noes 61.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JACKSON of Washington and Mr. LOVRE.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 102, noes 91.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Taber amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HILL to the amendment offered by Mr. TABER by adding the following language: "Provided, however, That no cut shall apply to those projects or units which are 50 percent or more completed at the beginning of the fiscal year 1952."

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment and all it does to this appropriation bill is to simply

say that all projects or units of a project that are more than 50 percent completed by the 1st of July 1952 shall not be affected by this cut. There is nothing unreasonable about this amendment to the Taber amendment. Let me say, frankly, if I have learned one thing in the 10 years I have been on the floor of the House, it is the foolishness of trying to legislate on the floor. I know on my side of the aisle Member after Member has bemoaned on the floor of this House the utter impossibility of coming to the proper type of a conclusion on amendments that affect an entire bill without having given consideration from every detail of the ramifications of the changes they are about to make. Here is an amendment that cuts over \$10,000,000 from this bill. Mr. Chairman, I hope I have the attention of the House because, how can you cut \$10,000,000 off of a bill when the amendment itself is not even clear enough for you to know or to figure where the cuts will come? Why, under this amendment as you now have it, which I think is worse than it was at the beginning, which was plenty bad, the Department of the Interior could finish any project they wished and take all the money off another project, regardless of what they were, whether it be a power plant or whether it be a dam. Certainly, this House does not want to legislate on that basis. And, why are you legislating that way? I will tell you why you are legislating that way, because you do not know what this amendment will actually accomplish. And why do you not know what this amendment will do? Because you are listening to your own Members on that side of the aisle. And, I respect the Members on both sides. I respect your judgments. I shall be the last one to question the motives of a single Member of this House. Here we have a bill brought in by a committee with a unanimous report. I have searched everywhere to find where I could offer cuts because I am in favor of cuts wherever possible at this critical time. Who is not in favor of curtailing expenses wherever possible?

But here is a committee that I have faith in. No man in this House has more faith than I in the gentlemen who serve us on the minority side on this committee. They have seen the project in my district. They know what we are trying to do. Not one of those men said one word about cutting this bill—not one. That is the subcommittee. So I go back to my original statement: Why do you want to legislate on an appropriation bill by going lower than this committee cut these appropriations?

This is almost impossible to believe, Mr. Chairman. Take the transmission lines and the power projects first. In this bill this committee in its wisdom never cut a nickel off the projects in Alaska. You just voted to cut nearly 10 percent off it. Every Member of this House knows what might happen should we get into a world war in Alaska. This committee never cut a penny off that. These gentlemen, Mr. JENSEN and Mr. FENTON, and every other member of the

subcommittee, sat in all the hearings of this subcommittee, and brought in this item. They never cut a nickel off the projects in Nevada. Do you have confidence in those men? Of course you do. Let us name another, in Colorado. They never cut a nickel off the transmission and powerlines. In New Mexico and Texas, not a nickel; and in the State of Washington just a very small amount. That is transmission and power lines combined. I am talking about the committee and their work.

Now let us get down to straight transmission lines. They are important. We have a project. What is the use of finishing the project where I live unless you have a transmission line, where there are no transmission lines? I agree with the gentleman from Washington who said we should not build power lines where private power can and will build them. I agree with the gentleman on the left-hand side that we should not build power lines where the private companies will build them. But let us see that they are built.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Let us take the transmission lines and see what this committee did. If this subcommittee is interested in anything, if this subcommittee examines this bill from any angle thoroughly and completely, it would certainly do so on the transmission lines. They never curtailed a single dime on the transmission lines in Alaska. That is interesting. The transmission lines in Colorado, the transmission lines in New Mexico and Arizona they did not cut. There are two or three other lines that had very, very little cuts. So the committee did a good job on those transmission lines.

Now let us get back to what I started to say in the beginning. Any type of project that this Congress had laid out and planned for and made appropriations for, if that project has gone along, whether it is power or whether it is for irrigation or whether it is a combination makes no difference, it should be completed. The point I make is that as the project begins to work its way through and the plans are completed and there is 50 percent of that project complete, it should be finished.

Let me ask you in all seriousness, who can stand up on the floor of the House and deny the statement that follows, which is that it is no economy to curtail the completion of these projects? You are taking money out of the Treasury, you are wasting money, and you are delaying the finishing of a project that might mean much in the war effort. The project I speak of personally is 60 percent complete. The most foolish thing this Congress could do, the most wasteful program you could adopt as to that project would be to delay its com-

pletion. And I say that is true of every project. Any project that is worth the consideration of this Congress, any project that has been given authorization by this Congress, if it is 50 percent complete it should not be delayed. These new projects that you are talking about, every last one of them, will come under the scrutiny and careful consideration of those in high places who determine where scarce and critical materials should be used. The chances for new projects are going to be pretty slim unless they are really and truly in furtherance of the war effort.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Would the gentleman be able to tell us how many of the projects involved in the \$207,000,000 in the bill are 50 percent or more completed? Would the gentleman be able to name those projects, if the list is not too long?

Mr. HILL. I checked on that very thing, and the gentleman would be surprised to know how many there are. But it is impossible at this time for me to give those figures. But there are many, many projects in the West which are more than 40 or 50 to 60 percent completed.

Mr. KEATING. Would it involve more than half of the projects, can the gentleman tell us, if his amendment is adopted?

Mr. HILL. I cannot say the exact number, but I think they are more than half completed. That would be my estimate.

Mr. KEATING. Could the gentleman tell us the stage of completion that the project has reached in his district, which he so ably represents?

Mr. HILL. As I mentioned a while ago it is over 60 percent completed. What we are doing now is putting the finishing touches on it. There are projects in exactly the same situation in other Western States. I would say the larger projects, even the ones in the Northwest, because of the war effort were finished or hurried along during World War II, and a good many of those projects are more than 50 percent completed.

Mr. KEATING. With reference to the project in the gentleman's district, for instance, how long would it take it to complete that project?

Mr. HILL. Of course, the word "complete" has a varied meaning. We are getting water and have been getting water for 2 years, and we are getting power and have been getting that for 3 years. So I would say our whole project should be pretty well completed in 2 years. Nineteen hundred and fifty-three is the date that we set.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LOVRE. Is not the gentleman in favor of completing all the projects that have been begun?

Mr. HILL. There again we hedge. Your project that you are speaking about, first of all, would it be considered as necessary in the war effort,

Mr. LOVRE. That is correct, but is not the gentleman in favor of completing all projects that are under construction regardless of whether they are 50 percent completed or 20 percent completed?

Mr. HILL. Of course we are in favor of completing them, or we would never have voted for the authorization in the first instance. I think that answers the gentleman's question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for an additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I appreciate very much what my good friend from Colorado is trying to do. However, I would like to ask the gentleman what he means by a project and by a unit. Some of these projects are of tremendous size and would take years and years to complete. And again a unit may be many different things. Therefore, it is a little difficult to get away from the basic ambiguity that we are up against in trying to define exactly what the amendment would do.

Mr. HILL. I would answer the gentleman by saying that we are on the horns of a dilemma. If you are going to adopt the Taber amendment which knocks off \$10,000,000, you had better have my amendment on it, and if you are going to vote against it, which I expect to do, you can certainly vote against my amendment with pleasure. What I am trying to do is to save these projects that you and I know should be completed and the units in these projects, which should be completed just as quickly as possible. No economy whatsoever can be accomplished or will any financial benefit accrue by delaying the completion of irrigation or power producing projects that are more than 50 percent finished.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I trust we are getting to the end of this debate. I shall not take much time. I am vitally interested in this matter. I come from the West, as you all know. In a case like this I have no other recourse than to fall back on the good judgment and wisdom of the committee that has considered this matter. Therefore, I should like to ask the chairman of this subcommittee some questions, and then I shall yield the floor.

May I ask you, Mr. Chairman, if the committee did not cut the funds for the Bureau of Reclamation when that item was before you?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. HORAN. I assume you weighed the matters that were involved in those cuts in the light of what it would do to the projects and the progress we need to have so as to protect the Federal investment?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I will answer the gentleman by saying that under the budget estimate you will note that the total construction figure is lumped into one amount, \$207,190,000. We cut the budget estimate from \$223,690,000 to \$207,190,000. In reaching that lower figure we went over each and every project submitted to the committee through the Bureau of the Budget. We tried to follow a rule of reason, that projects which were pretty well along should receive as much of the money as we could allow in order to complete them. We went over it very meticulously and very carefully.

Mr. HORAN. And where money had been invested and commitments of the people were involved, you tried to protect that situation?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. We did.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish the gentleman would ask the chairman of this committee this question, if this particular part of the appropriation bill came out with the full approval of the subcommittee.

Mr. HORAN. Do I understand that is the case?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Yes. In all fairness, I must say that on some matters there were differences of opinion. We do not take formal votes in any sense, but I think I can say that there was general agreement. There are some things in here that I do not like, and there are probably other things that each member of the committee did not like. I would not take it upon myself to speak for the committee and say that each item was concurred in unanimously. There was no minority report, as such, but each member reserved the right to take whatever position he feels best when the bill reaches the floor. We have always had that understanding in the committee.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. Certainly.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to address a question to the gentleman from Washington, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. JACKSON]. Under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], I have been shown some figures, since I addressed my question to the gentleman from Colorado, which would indicate that if his amendment were adopted it would apply in dollar value to something like three-quarters or four-fifths of all the projects. It strikes me that if it would apply to those it might be an undue hardship on the remaining one-fourth or one-fifth, if the gentleman's amendment were adopted.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. To answer the gentleman from New York

[Mr. KEATING] I will put it this way: I cannot answer that question unless I know what the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] will actually do. Of course, that involves logically a definition of "project" and "unit." The amendment does not define these terms.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] has expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. For myself, I am content to follow the judgment of the subcommittee which has weighed and considered this entire matter.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. Is it not true that the Taber amendment will affect the Grand Coulee project, and the Administrator, if it so desires, could cut off transmission lines from the Grand Coulee?

Mr. HORAN. That is absolutely true; there is no question about it.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman is a member of the Appropriations Committee, is he not?

Mr. HORAN. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. The committee goes into detail in the various parts of an appropriation bill.

Mr. HORAN. That is right.

Mr. HILL. And the gentleman still makes the statement that he thinks we should go along with it.

Mr. HORAN. That is right.

Mr. HILL. That is one item on which I wholeheartedly agree.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I offered would cut about 4½ percent off of these projects. Frankly, it could be apportioned equally, and I do not believe a single one of them would be hurt. The Department itself and the Bureau have gone ahead without regard to what the Congress has done so many times that I believe it is time for us to do something about it.

The amendment I offered provides small cuts. On the other hand, if we limit its operation to those that are not 50 percent completed it probably would stop all work upon a lot of them, and I do not know, frankly, just exactly how that would work out.

I have on page 431 of the hearings a table which indicates the percentage of cost, the amount of their operation. The amendment that the gentleman has offered would cut out work entirely upon the Alaska item; it would cut out work upon a great many others, and I would think that they could apportion that \$10,000,000 in the Bureau of Reclamation without hurting the general set-up at all; but I am afraid they could not with the proposal that the gentlemen from Colorado has submitted.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we discuss in these appropriation bills many things, all of them of weight and importance, but the one essential issue which we are debating here either directly or indirectly in these various appropriation bills, is how to avoid a third world war or, if we must fight, how to win it. That is the vital question directly or indirectly involved in all of these propositions and in the particular amendment before us.

I remember very well, Mr. Chairman, that in the beginning of the Second World War there was a proposal to build one more dam in the Tennessee Valley Authority. The proposition was vigorously opposed by the same interests who are opposing the appropriation provided in this bill. They said it was too much money; it was unnecessary; that we could not complete the dam in time. All these familiar arguments you have heard offered here this afternoon, but fortunately by a narrow margin we went ahead and built that dam. If we had not built that dam, if we had not had available the power produced by that additional dam we could not have produced enough aluminum to have outfitted the vast cloud of airplanes that won the war. No one from that day to this has doubted the advisability, the wisdom, and the prudence of having appropriated the additional money necessary to the construction and operation of that dam.

Mr. Chairman, there are many elements which enter into the winning of a war. One, to which no one gives a great deal of attention, is the matter of food. If a third world war must be fought, we must not only feed our people, our armies, the armies of our Allies but the people of our Allies as we did in the last two wars.

Napoleon once said an army travels on its belly and another great French general also stated that if he was confronted with the alternative of having an army without food or an army without weapons, he would take the army without weapons, because the army without weapons would have a better chance of winning a war than an army without food. The question of the production of food at a reasonable cost is directly involved in this amendment.

Furthermore we must have electric power to meet the needs of our increasingly complex industrial system, in order to take the place of inadequate manpower, in order to provide for the continued prosperity of this country, because electric power invariably produces an increase in our national economy.

Mr. Chairman, the committee cut this bill deeply. Large retrenchments have already been effected. And I think you know my attitude and my record on economy. I have introduced bills to cut more money than were ever introduced before or since in this House. And I agree here that we should cut out every dollar we can, but if we are going to have a war—a war we hope and pray that may never come—but if we do, we are going to need every bit of this power and need it badly.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that any amendments which are offered to cut such appropriations below the reductions al-

ready made in this bill, will be voted down. It is a question of lessening our chances of avoiding total war, of weakening national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 82, noes 88.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JACKSON of Washington and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 112, noes 110.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 16, line 3, strike out the period and insert the following: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely carries out the intent of the committee as repeatedly expressed in the debate on this bill. That intent is that the Government should not construct duplicating transmission lines where private utilities have agreed to wheel power over their lines to Government customers at a reasonable rate. The amendment guarantees that the Bureau of Reclamation will carry out this policy without any doubt. It makes certain that in the expenditure of the appropriations included in this bill the Bureau will follow the will of Congress.

In order to make plain the intent of the committee, allow me to quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. At page 4259 of the RECORD the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], a member of the committee, said:

The committee has taken the position that you should not construct duplicate transmission lines if the private utilities will wheel the power over existing lines at a reasonable rate.

He further stated:

I want to caution the Members of the House, if they are interested in protecting the public, when these amendments come up tomorrow on the question of transmission lines, just ask yourselves this one question: Have the private utilities made a reasonable offer for wheeling power? The truth is that the various private companies throughout the country have been able to get together and agree on a wheeling rate, a reasonable rate. * * * The committee has no desire to go helter-skelter in building transmission lines all over the country. The provisions of the Flood Control Act of 1944, the basic law that the committee is charged with carrying out, will be followed strictly in accordance with the dictates of the Congress of the United States. That means

that it is the responsibility of our committee to make sure that the power generated at the dams will be delivered to the preferred customers at fair and reasonable rate.

The gentleman from Washington is to be complimented on his clear and concise statements regarding the policy of Congress on the question of the construction of duplicating transmission facilities in those areas where the private utilities have made reasonable contracts to wheel Government power. I wish to emphasize that my amendment is in complete harmony with those statements and envisions the implementation of that policy. We recognize, as the gentleman from Washington stated, that—

The committee has no desire to go helter-skelter in building transmission lines all over the country.

However, this amendment will guarantee that the Bureau of Reclamation will be unable to ignore that desire. Past experience with this Bureau demonstrates clearly the desirability of spelling out in detail the limitations on their activities which Congress expects the Bureau to follow.

Again in general debate on Monday last, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] also a member of the Interior subcommittee from this side of the aisle, corroborated the statements by the gentleman from Washington when he stated that—

Every member of the Interior subcommittee of the House and the Senate has for several years taken the position that we should not build duplicating transmission lines with the people's money where there are sufficient transmission lines already in operation.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] also alluded to the granting of appropriations in order to give the Government sufficient bargaining power to bring about a reasonable contract to protect the public interest.

I wish to make it plain that this amendment will not affect the bargaining power which may be given to Government agencies in the way of appropriations, past, present, or future, in the slightest degree. This amendment applies only to those areas where wheeling contracts are in force. The amendment, I should also point out, applies only to the areas where the Bureau of Reclamation has jurisdiction.

Another member of the Interior Subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO] reemphasized the position of the subcommittee on the expenditure of funds for duplicating transmission lines. The gentleman from Massachusetts stated, and again I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 4400 and 4401:

Now, as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] pointed out, the position of the subcommittee has been in general that they do not want to spend any money where it is not necessary to spend it, and especially where a private concern can take care of the situation all around. * * *

This committee has been very fair in striking out lines where past experience showed that perhaps there was no harm in doing it.

I wholeheartedly support the position of the subcommittee, as stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I do not question the fairness of the committee.

The chairman of the Interior Subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], also referred to this matter when he said:

The committee is for eliminating a lot of the lines asked for in the budget.

He also referred to what had been done in the way of reaching agreement in the six southwestern States, California and other States for the wheeling of Government power by the private companies. This amendment will guarantee that the Bureau will not take it upon itself to build duplicating lines where such contracts have been consummated.

Our esteemed Speaker took the floor of the House in the debate on this measure as he did last year on this subject and told us of the successful cooperation achieved in his area between private and public power under the operation of wheeling contracts. The Speaker by his words made it clear that he agreed with the policy as enunciated by the members of the committee in the debate on this bill. The Speaker said in part—page 4408:

We did not belong to the crowd that thinks there should be no public power, nor did we belong to the other crowd that does not think there should be any private power. Working together they could perform a great service to the people of this country.

I also said at that time that we did not intend to use any money to go out and confiscate anybody's property, that where a utility company had a line and they would carry our power at a reasonable rate no lines would be paralleled and none have been paralleled. * * *

This is a demonstration in the United States of America where private enterprise and Government can get along together, both of them wanting to be fair and just, and making contracts and living up to them. * * *

But if the time comes when the people who own the lines will not transmit electricity to preferred customers or will not carry the Government power at a reasonable rate, then that would be another story.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will make sure, without any question, that the intent of the committee will be carried out and the will of Congress will be followed in this important matter.

In view of the statements by the chairman and by the members of the committee, I entertain the hope that the committee will accept and not oppose this amendment.

Public power has its proper place in constructing facilities and furnishing service where private power is unable or unwilling to do so. If free enterprise can and will do the job, I believe it should be encouraged. Certainly we should not go out of our way to discourage private power developments, particularly when such discouragement takes the form of putting the Government needlessly into business at the expense of the taxpayers and wage earners throughout the country who must foot the bill. These are sentiments

which hold true at any time. Obviously, facing as we do staggering defense expenditures, we must now be more vigilant than ever to pare unnecessary spending.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York said that they were satisfied to go along with the proposition where there were private lines if the Government would not duplicate them. I cannot agree or go along with all of that because where the Government has millions of dollars invested, and I mean millions of dollars, and where they are entitled to power at all times, and especially since we are going to spend \$66,000,000,000 in this effort right now, and no one knows what it will cost before we are through. I am for putting in a power line of the Government where the Government has \$50,000,000 already spent on a project. That is what the law said when this flood control act was passed. It is up to the Government to deliver that power to the regular customers. I do not mean the private utility customers, but I mean the Government. Where the Government has spent money in the projects and has its own installations, the lines should be put in. No; I would not want to go along and let a private utility just say, "Serve the Government." I cannot see, where the Government has spent hundreds of millions of dollars, why they should do that. We hear a great deal about the boys laying down their lives, and we see a lot of the camouflage that is being spread all over the Congress. But I can tell you that the Virginia Power & Light Co. has been taking away from the Government of the United States quite a bit of money. You hear talk about saving taxes for the taxpayers. I gave a statement here last week where the Virginia Power & Light has charged the United States Government more than they do in the city of Cleveland, in the State of Ohio, and where they charge them more out in California. Whose money is the Virginia Power & Light Co. taking? Surely it is the taxpayers. They are not taking it away from France or somebody else. It is being taken from the taxpayers, not only the taxpayers of Virginia but the taxpayers of the United States. They are taking that money from them. Where we have \$150,000,000 invested, and where we are trying to get a little knowledge scientifically, to keep ahead of Russia, I am not for that kind of saving. Men come out here in this well and say, "Oh, we must save some money for the boys who are laying down their lives." Right over here in Virginia, across the river, where coal is cheap, almost less expensive as it is in Ohio, where we have to ship it 200 miles, they are charging the United States Government more than is being charged in Ohio.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Certainly I am no authority on this, but believe the amendment which I have offered could not in any way apply to any of the Virginia lines.

Mr. KIRWAN. I understand that, but what I am trying to get at is this: I have tried for 4 days in debate on this bill to point this out: Right across the river, where one of the largest wind tunnels of them all is located, it is costing the Government more to purchase the power, because they are charging that much to deliver it there. And they also agreed to sell power to the United States Government for only 1,000 hours out of 7,000. From midnight until 6 in the morning. They only agreed to sell so many kilowatts. That is right across the river, within 50 miles of the Capital of the United States.

Yes, I know there are a couple of small minor lines in this bill out in California, but the three lines in this bill are for Government installations, not private customers. It is for a navy yard, and it is for a camp where these kids they have been talking about laying down their lives are located. Certainly I am for the Government delivering power to their own installations.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman does not differ with the philosophy contained in this amendment; that is, to the effect that the transmission lines should not be constructed where the areas are being adequately served by private power companies?

Mr. KIRWAN. I am not against private power companies. I am not for the Government taking profits away from private industry. I am for private industry. That is where I received my livelihood until I came to Congress. I would be very ungrateful if I turned against them now. But where the Government has a place like Langley Field, or out in California, I am for the Government delivering its own power as long as the Government has it, and as long as the Government has half a billion dollars invested in those places.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I think the pending amendment once again indicates the difficulty in trying to legislate on the floor of the House. I do not know whether the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] is aware of the fact or not that in some of these wheeling contracts there are specific provisions permitting the private power company to turn down the construction of a given line if it is not economically feasible for them to build the line, or for whatever reason they want to give. Of course, in such event it is incumbent upon the Federal Government to build the transmission line.

There is no sense in debating this kind of an amendment to tie the hands of the Government in working out these contracts.

In addition to that, in many areas there are peculiar problems of voltage requirements. The private companies may want to build a 120,000 kilowatt line, but the Government's preferred customer may want a larger line. There are differences that must be worked out in each and every instance.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that it seems to me this amendment covers that point in that it only provides that the appropriation shall not be used for the construction of transmission facilities where there is a contract which includes a provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers. In other words, if the contract did not make that adequate provision this amendment would not apply.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Of course, if they have a contract covering these lines there is no need for this amendment. So I just do not see the point to the gentleman's amendment. It will have the effect of tying the hands of the Government.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Who can say what the gentleman's amendment really means in terms of paralleling of lines. For instance, a line say 50 miles away may parallel a proposed installation by the Government. Is not the amendment confusing and indeterminate as to the point to which it shall be followed and indeterminate on the Government agency?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I will not attempt to answer the gentleman at this time other than to say that I think it has the ultimate effect of making it very difficult for a given Government agency in any area to enter into fair and equitable wheeling arrangements.

I hope that under all the circumstances the House will vote this amendment down.

The committee has taken a lot of time to consider each and every transmission line included in the budget. If we had not given fair and careful consideration to these lines the House might have some ground to complain. There is a certain group within the House of Representatives—it is their right, I do not challenge their right—that do not want the Government to build any transmission line regardless of the merit and need for such lines. That is fundamentally what is at issue here today. I am not directing my remarks necessarily to the gentleman from New York—I think the Federal Government should reserve in all instances—and I was careful in my remarks to leave out the Federal Government—in building a transmission line from its own dam to its own facilities. That certainly is a legitimate right that goes with sovereignty. I see no reason why we should hamstring the Federal

Government in trying to transport the power from its own power projects to federally operated facilities.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Does not the gentleman think, however, that wherever it is possible for private enterprise to do it, if there is any doubt whatever let us resolve it in favor of private enterprise that has always carried the torch of progress in this country?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. For myself, I want to resolve all doubt in the public interest. We are not dealing, I may say to the gentleman from Michigan, with private enterprise in its true sense because a private utility is a monopoly. Our system of private enterprise is based on competition. The Government cannot get competitive bids to wheel power in a given area. They must bargain and bargain exclusively with one given private utility. I have made that clear. This committee has done a fair and decent job; we have gone through the bill meticulously, and have tried our best to protect the public interest.

Mr. DONDERO. There is a philosophy involved in that: One believes in public power, the other in private power.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. No; this law has been established a long time. The law goes back to the days of Teddy Roosevelt and continued through Democratic administrations. It is that the Government must sell the power to its preferred customers. Is the gentleman opposed to that philosophy?

Mr. DONDERO. Wherever private enterprise can do it I think the Government should let them do it.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. And let them charge their own rate?

Mr. DONDERO. They do not charge their own rate, because every State in the Union has a rate-making agency.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The State agencies have no jurisdiction over agreements between—

Mr. DONDERO. Then we have the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The Federal Power Commission has no jurisdiction over the fixing of wheeling rates between the Federal Government and private utilities. The gentleman is referring to the wholesaling and the retailing of power.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman from Washington explained this wheeling charge in committee. Several Members have asked me what a wheeling charge is. I endeavored to explain it. Will the gentleman explain the wheeling charge, and what it is?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska that the wheeling charge varies in given areas.

Mr. STEFAN. What is the wheeling charge?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. A wheeling charge is the fee or the rate which the private utility company will charge to deliver Government power from the bus bar or the dam to the Government's preferred customers.

Mr. STEFAN. It is like a carrying charge?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. It is like a common carrier. The carrier in this instance is a transmission line. The sole question that comes up is, What is a fair and reasonable rate to charge for the wheeling or the carrying of that power from the bus bar to the preferred customer? That is the great area within which there is disagreement. The committee has tried to arm Uncle Sam with reasonable and decent bargaining power so that if the private utility will not agree to a reasonable rate then the Government can carry out its long-established policy of carrying the power from the dams to the preferred customers.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I understood the gentleman from Michigan to say that he believed in private industry constructing these plants where it could be done. The gentleman does not believe that in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway, nor does he believe that in connection with the Niagara plant at Niagara Falls.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will vote down the amendment and carry out what the committee has tried to do in reaching fair and decent agreements.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman; I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman heard the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] with respect to the Langley Field proposition, calling attention again to the fact that the private utility had offered to deliver current to Langley Field, but never in excess of a certain number of hours. Can the gentleman tell the committee or does he have any information to indicate whether Buggs Island, the Government-owned project, could supply power to Langley Field for a period of time in excess of that which has been agreed to by the Virginia Electric & Power Co.?

Mr. GARY. There has been more misinformation spread on this floor about the Virginia situation than I have ever heard on any subject. With respect to the refusal of the Virginia Electric & Power Co. to supply the power, they have agreed to supply all of the power that NACA wants at all times. NACA has asked for a 150,000-kilowatt supply for special experiments. Those experiments are not conducted during peak load hours. They are conducted during off-peak hours. The NACA has never requested that amount of power to be supplied to them continuously. The Southeastern Power Administration could only supply a 150,000-kilowatt load for 20 hours a week. That has been determined by scientific survey.

Mr. HARDY. So that if the line were built and reliance were had on Buggs Island power only 20 hours a week of the maximum requirement could be delivered?

Mr. GARY. Exactly, and they could not supply the need of Langley Field, so the Virginia Electric & Power Co. would have to supply the excess.

Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of submitting to the House at this time some additional information touching the amendment which I offered and was adopted last week striking from the bill \$3,400,000 for the Southeastern Power Administration for the construction of certain transmission lines. This project was first proposed as a national-defense measure. We were told that the lines were necessary to supply electricity for the operation of a proposed wind tunnel which the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics plans to construct at Langley Field, Va. I stated when I offered the amendment that the Virginia Electric & Power Co. was ready, willing, and able to supply all of the power which the NACA required, and that it had offered to supply this power for identically the same price that the Southeastern proposes to charge, and, in addition, that it had offered the NACA three alternate proposals, all of which are more favorable to NACA than the Southeastern proposals.

I am happy to report that since the amendment was adopted, although a contract has not actually been executed, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and the Virginia Electric & Power Co. have reached complete agreement for the furnishing of this power. On April 26, Dr. H. J. E. Reid, Director of Langley Aeronautical Laboratory of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics addressed the following letter to J. G. Holtzclaw, president of the Virginia Electric & Power Co.:

APRIL 26, 1951.

Mr. J. G. HOLTZCLAW,
President, Virginia Electric & Power Co.,
Richmond, Va.

Subject: Power supply for 150,000 kilowatt demand.

Reference: Your letter to NACA dated February 15, 1951.

DEAR MR. HOLTZCLAW: At the time your Mr. Lawrence delivered the proposed form of contract, the various changes which you suggested to our previous draft were dis-

cussed with members of our staff. We were not in full agreement with the changes which you proposed and we undertook to reword it to meet both your requirements and those of the Government.

The attached form of contract is considered satisfactory to this agency and we would like to have your further comments. We, too, are hopeful that we may reach complete agreement in the very near future in order that the necessary construction plans may proceed without delay.

Sincerely yours,

H. J. E. REID, Director.

On April 30, Mr. Holtzclaw replied to Dr. Reid as follows:

APRIL 30, 1951.

Dr. H. J. E. REID,
Director, Langley Aeronautical Laboratory,
Langley Air Force Base, Va.

DEAR DR. REID: We appreciate your letter of April 26, enclosing form of contract for power supply for 150,000-kilowatt demand at Langley Aeronautical Laboratory. We note that the form of contract as submitted is satisfactory to you.

Over the week end, this contract has been reviewed by our engineering and operating staff and we have no changes to suggest. We are, therefore, proceeding to draw up the contract in final form, and Mr. Lawrence will call upon you during the week with signed copies for delivery to you.

Immediately upon execution of the contract, we will proceed with plans for the construction of the third 110,000-volt line to the base, to connect with our double circuit line at Suffolk, in order that this connection may be completed by the time our new 100,000-kilowatt plant near Portsmouth is ready for operation, which is now scheduled for October 1952.

Sincerely yours,

J. G. HOLTZCLAW, President.

In my judgment the question of national defense has never been involved in this proposed project. It was merely use by the Southeastern as an excuse for its attempt to encroach upon free enterprise. In view of the above agreement, however, any possible question of the national defense has been eliminated.

The only question now remaining is that of providing a market for the Southeastern's Buggs Island power. The Virginia Electric & Power Co. is ready, willing, and able to enter into a reasonable contract with Southeastern for the wheeling and firming of this power.

On April 6, it wired the Southeastern Power Administration as follows:

BEN W. CREIM,

Administrator, Southeastern
Power Administration, Elberton, Ga.:

The secretary's release, dated April 4, quotes you to the effect that agreement has been reached on all major provisions of the contract for Buggs Island power except for the charge which would be made by the company for wheeling to preference customers. As a means to an early settlement of the wheeling-charge problem, the company proposes that the matter of this charge be submitted to the Federal Power Commission, which must give final approval of your wholesale rates, for decision and that both parties accept and abide by its decision. We are sure that you will agree with us that settlement of this issue is vital in the interest of national defense, since a contract between the two parties will make it unnecessary for you to build any transmission lines and will result in the saving of millions

of dollars of public funds, vast quantities of critical materials, and the conservation of thousands of man-hours of labor. We will cooperate fully to obtain an early decision.

M. C. SMITH,
Vice President and General Manager,
Virginia Electric & Power Co.

The Southeastern Power Administration refused this offer on April 7. Last Friday, April 27, the Virginia Electric & Power Co. again wired the Southeastern Power Administration offering to wheel power to Southeastern's preferred customers at its average transmission cost with the further suggestion that this cost be determined by a panel of three experts—one to be appointed by Southeastern, one to be appointed by Virginia Electric & Power Co., and the third to be the Chief of the Power Bureau of the Federal Power Commission.

I cannot imagine any fairer proposition that could be made. If the Southeastern Power Administration refuses to accept such a proposition, it proves conclusively to my mind that it is determined to enter the power field in competition with private enterprise, and that the failure to reach an agreement in this matter is the fault of the Southeastern and not of the Virginia Electric & Power Co.

The House has already voted nearly 2 to 1 to strike the transmission lines from the bill. I, therefore, insert this record merely for the information of the Members of the House.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I take it from the gentleman's remarks that he would favor my amendment but he feels that it is not strong enough; in other words, that no part of this appropriation should be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, but that the gentleman would feel that it perhaps should go even further and say that no part should be used where the private utilities have evidenced a willingness and readiness to transmit power in that manner. Am I stretching it too far?

Mr. GARY. I am simply asking the Congress to take care of a specific case where there is no question about the fact that the private power company has gone to reasonable limits in trying to reach a satisfactory agreement.

(Mr. GARY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, again I say that I am very, very thankful for what the gentleman from Virginia just informed the Congress took place between the Virginia Electric & Power Co. and the Government, but I again want to tell the gentleman that before it passed the House it came into the Congress last year that they would not give to the United States Government a contract except for 1,000 hours a year. That is in the rec-

ord. Whatever they are doing now they are doing because the Congress passed a law. The Virginia Electric & Power Co. offered to the United States Government power only for the hours of 12 o'clock midnight to 6 in the morning, and only for 1,000 hours a year. So I am thankful that the gentleman from Virginia says they have seen the light now. But why did they not see it last year? We would never have had that discussion down on the floor then. Why did they not give the United States Government the power it asked and when it wanted it? Oh, they will do it now, sure. They are all rushing in here and saying the Virginia Electric & Power Co. wants to give the United States Government or its representative power when they want it, for as many hours as they want it, and they want to give it a cheap contract, but they would not give it to them a year ago until the United States Government said, "Go ahead and build your own line." That is when they saw the light. There is no misinformation down here in the well given about the Virginia Electric & Power Co. No; she is a champion for high prices. I think it is one of the highest in the United States, despite the fact there is plenty of coal there for very cheap power.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to trespass upon your time briefly to make several observations with regard to the proposed power line from the Buggs Island Dam to Langley Field, Va. There has been considerable discussion about this as well as considerable controversy. The question involved really was whether the Southeastern Power Administration would build this line or whether the Virginia Electric & Power Co. would wheel the power from Buggs Island to Langley Field. It was understood that the Southeastern Power Administration did not wish to build a line if a proper contract could be negotiated with the Virginia Electric & Power Co. as to the wheeling of the Buggs Island Dam power.

Now another question is who is interested in this matter. We, of course, realize that the NACA was interested as to the actual power delivered to Langley Field. But there are other people vitally interested in the wheeling of this power. I have reference to the REA co-ops in Virginia. They have a vital interest, due to the fact that the Congress in its wisdom in enacting the Flood Control Act created certain priorities as to who would receive this power and who would have priority in receiving it. Down in southwest and central Virginia there are a number of rural people who are receiving light and power today because of the REA program. They have an interest in who will get power from the Buggs Island Dam; how they will get it and how much they will pay for the wheeling of it. For that reason I am interested in this particular controversy.

I think for the record in view of what my fine friend and able statesman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] has said about a contract being practically

entered into, about the delivery of power to Langley Field, we should put in the RECORD and pin point in RECORD exactly what has been said and what the proposition is that is held out to us, as to the wheeling of power from Buggs Island Dam, as well as the price that this power would be wheeled by the Virginia Electric & Power Co. That is why I am trespassing on your time.

It was my understanding that the gentleman from Virginia stated on last Tuesday before this body, and it is to be found in the RECORD of April 24 at page 4397 as follows:

The Virginia Electric & Power Co. stands ready to wheel the power at the price in effect on any major wheeling and firming Government contract now in effect. Moreover, when the Southeastern refused to accept these generous offers, the Virginia Electric & Power Co. proposed that the question of rates be submitted to the Federal Power Commission, each party agreeing to abiding by the Commission's decision.

Of course, so far as referring to the Federal Power Commission is concerned, we all understand why the SEPC would not agree to that. Almost the very same question has already been determined when they brought up the other question of who would build the Roanoke Rapids Dam. None of us who had a case in court would want to try his case before a judge where the same facts have already adversely been decided. We all know that the Power Commission decided that the Virginia Electric & Power Co. should build this. I am not now quarreling with that decision but am merely pointing out that the FPC has already held that Virginia Electric & Power Co. offer of rates, charges, and so forth, so far as they are concerned, are fair.

In the telegram sent to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] by the president of the Virginia Electric & Power Co., we find the following—

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he gets on to that point?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I call attention to the fact that when the REA was created and went to work in Virginia, the State of Virginia had 7.6 percent of her farms electrified and as of the 30th of June last year, as a result of the work of the REA, Virginia had 91 percent of its farms electrified.

Mr. ABBITT. I thank the gentleman for his observation. A copy of this telegram was sent to me, and to all Members of the Virginia delegation:

VEPCO had offered to accept the wheeling charges contained in any major contract covering wheeling and firming of power that had so far been approved by the Interior Department—

And further on in the telegram:

We reaffirm that we will wheel to SPEC's customers for the wheeling charges contained in any major contract covering wheeling and firming of power.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. If the Virginia Electric & Power Co. follows that commitment, can we be assured

that Virginia farmers will receive electricity at a proper rate?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 3 additional minutes, so that he may answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. I thank the gentleman for making the request.

In my opinion, if that commitment and if that statement is followed through bona fide, then we can depend upon our farmers being treated fairly. I just want to say I hope there will be no weaseling or vacillating about the matter.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. But suppose there is, will it be possible to return here at a subsequent time in a subsequent appropriation bill and have that taken care of?

Mr. ABBITT. That of course is entirely possible. And I assume that if it develops that the assurances are not carried out bona fide then steps can be taken to remedy the situation.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. If the gentleman would yield, I would like to make an observation: that I have supported the Gary amendment on the assurance that the Virginia Power Co. would comply with that commitment made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]. I sincerely hope that if they do not comply with it, that the appropriation may be restored in a subsequent appropriation bill.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. GARY. If the Virginia Electric & Power Co. does not live up to its contracts and its commitments, I will personally help the gentleman get any change in the law that is necessary.

Mr. ABBITT. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

I particularly wanted to comment on what was said by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON]. I want to thank him personally for the clear statement that he wrote in his letter to the Virginia Electric & Power Co., dated April 26, 1951, as well as his keen interest and help in attempting to get the question of charge for wheeling this power settled on a fair basis. I join in his sentiments, and hereby insert his letter of April 26, 1951 to VEPCO in the RECORD at this point, under permission to put it in as extraneous matter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1951.
Mr. J. C. HOLTZCLAW,
President, Virginia Electric & Power Co.,
Richmond, Va.

DEAR MR. HOLTZCLAW: I have your letter of April 19, 1951. I have delayed answering it until after I could have the benefit of the debate on the floor of the House.

As you have now been advised, the Gary amendment was adopted by a vote of about 2 to 1 and the item for an appropriation to the Southeastern Power Administration for

the construction of transmission lines has been eliminated for the time being.

I think it fair that you should know the reasons that impelled me to support this amendment and the conditions under which your position will have my support in the future.

I believe that the Government should not enter any phase of the power business except when necessary to protect the interest of the public. Especially is this true when such entry calls for large expenditures by the Federal Government during a time when the solvency of the Nation is in jeopardy as a result of huge appropriations for military expenditures to protect our very existence.

The application of this rule to the instant case raised two questions:

1. Is the public power line necessary to provide the Government adequate power at proper rates for its operations at Langley Field?

2. Is the public power line necessary to carry out the mandate of law that Virginia rural cooperatives shall have preferential rights to power generated at river developments?

I was induced to believe that such construction is not necessary for either purpose for the following reasons:

1. The statement made by Mr. GARY on the floor on your authority that you "stand ready to wheel the power at the price in effect on any major wheeling and firming Government contract now in effect."

2. That in the event of disagreement on any details of your contract for wheeling this power from Buggs Island, such differences should be submitted to the Federal Power Commission for arbitration.

3. I am also advised that in recent litigations before the Virginia State Corporation Commission involving the application of the Old Dominion Electric Cooperative, your company successfully contended that you could wheel the power from Buggs Island to the load centers of the rural cooperatives at a cheaper price than Old Dominion and that you predicated such contention upon a definite flat "postage stamp" wheeling rate.

I believe that in dealing with the Government and the Virginia cooperatives, there is a clear obligation upon your company to contract with them on the basis of the foregoing commitments.

The cooperatives have insisted to me that once freed of the threat of this Government line, your company will be unwilling to follow through on these commitments and that as a result electrical power at proper rates will be denied to many thousands of Virginia farmers. I sincerely trust that their fears in this regard are unfounded.

Should the Government be unable to obtain from you adequate power at proper rates for its operations at Langley Field, or should the wheeling charged for rural electrification be such as to contravene the provision of law giving preference for that purpose, I would feel impelled to change my position as to the necessity of these lines in a subsequent deficiency appropriation bill this year or the regular bill next year.

I have discussed the provisions of this letter with Messrs. GARY, HARDY, and FUGATE and have been told by them that they are in agreement with the views herein expressed.

With every good wish, I am

Sincerely yours,

BURR P. HARRISON.

(Copies to Hon. Robt. Whitehead, Mr. L. E. Long, Mr. S. A. Tankersley, Mr. D. W. Burruss, Hon. L. H. Hoover, Hon. J. Vaughan Gary, Hon. Porter Hardy, Jr., Hon. Tom B. Fugate.)

There are a number of contracts that have been negotiated by the Department of the Interior which I think cover the

situation. The main contention on the part of the REA and the Virginia Electric Power Co. now is whether power from Buggs Island will be wheeled for 1 mill. There are a number of contracts that have been made at the rate or charge of 1 mill. The Ottetail Power Co. of North Dakota and Minnesota is 1 mill. The Northwestern Public Service Co. of South Dakota is 1 mill. The Montana-Dakota Utilities of Montana and North Dakota is 1.069 mills. The Central Electric Cooperative—generation and transmission—of South Dakota is 1 mill. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. of California is 1 mill for 44 kilowatts or above.

Mr. WERDEL. One mill for how great a distance?

Mr. ABBITT. As I understand, for their area.

Mr. WERDEL. Fifty miles?

Mr. ABBITT. Fifty miles, and some of it as far as 400 miles. In view of what the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] has stated in regard to the contract being negotiated between the NACA and VEPCO there is no reason for the continued controversy on this particular appropriation now under discussion; but there is a vital necessity of getting clear for the record exactly what proposals have been made to the Members of the House and others as to charges to be made as to the wheeling of power from the Buggs Island Dam by VEPCO.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two additional minutes so that I may ask him a couple of questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I understood the chairman of the committee correctly, I understood him to say the Virginia company is demanding a much higher rate or charging a much higher rate than is charged in Ohio and in California for similar service. If that is true, would this proposal which has been submitted by the Virginia Power & Light Co. correct that discrepancy to which the chairman referred?

Mr. ABBITT. I do not know about the new proposal for Langley Field and am not informed fully as to its provisions. I am interested in getting the power wheeled around in the rural areas at a reasonable charge or rate regardless of the contract being made as to Langley.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand, but I do not owe any money to the Virginia Power Co. or any other power company. What I want to clear up in my mind is why the authorities of Government pay the Virginia corporation a much higher rate for a service than those authorities of Government pay to people in other parts of the country for the same service.

Mr. KIRWAN. That is what I was talking about a while ago. That is why we are talking about a Government line. There is no other place to get the power, except from a private line. That is why

they put the tariff on the Government. That is why we want to build a Government line.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But we have been in Government to make purchases of these things, and if the administrators who do the purchasing are so weak-kneed, are so short of vertebrae that they pay the Virginia company a much higher rate than they pay the companies in Ohio and California for the same service, the trouble is down here in the purchasing department, and not on the floor of this House.

Mr. ABBITT. The gentleman is confused about the situation apparently.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. GARY. I would like to say that this just is not true, that the Virginia Electric & Power Co. offered the Government a cheaper rate than the Government agency, the Southeastern Power Company, would offer it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what I wanted to bring out.

Mr. GARY. I have made that statement on the floor time and time again, and it is absolutely true. The NACA is satisfied with it and they have accepted their proposition.

Mr. ABBITT. Let me say to the gentleman that so far as this proposition is concerned that since this project has been started the rate offered by the Virginia Electric & Power Co. has been considerably lessened.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the good of discussion.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, as stated before there are only three ways in which the electric co-ops in Virginia can secure the available power from Buggs Island Dam even though they are in a preferred class: First, their own lines; second, lines built by the SEPA; third, Virginia Electric & Power Co. lines.

The appropriation in question undoubtedly will be kept out of the bill which, for the time being, eliminates the possibility of the SEPA building the line to Langley Field, and this of course is perfectly agreeable, provided a proper contract for wheeling the power can be negotiated with Virginia Electric & Power Co. It is to be noted that the Virginia Electric & Power Co. in their telegram of April 27 to Mr. GARY, copy of which was sent to me and I assume to the other Members of the Virginia delegation in the House, made a further suggestion in speaking of the wheeling cost "that this cost be determined by a panel of three experts—one to be appointed by SEPA, one to be appointed by VEPCO and the third to be the Chief of the Power Bureau of the Federal Power Commission." Suffice it to say that the main Federal Power Commission witness in the Roanoke Rapids case before the Federal Power Commission was the Chief of the Bureau of Power of the Commission and he testified very strongly in favor of VEPCO. In view of this, I can well understand why the SEPA would not desire to have the Chief of the Bureau of Power of the Federal Power Commission as one of the arbitrators.

Much discussion has revolved around the charges for wheeling the power from Buggs Island Dam to the various co-ops. This question vitally affects my section of Virginia as well as other sections, and I am very hopeful that a contract can be negotiated between the SEPA and VEPCO or the co-ops and VEPCO for the wheeling of this power at a reasonable rate. I am informed that much negotiation has been going on between SEPA and VEPCO, and for the sake of the Record so that there can be no misunderstanding I desire at this point to quote from several letters showing what has taken place.

I received a letter dated March 2, 1951, addressed to the Honorable BURR P. HARRISON, Hon. PORTER HARDY, Jr., myself, and Hon. THOMAS B. FUGATE from an attorney representing the Old Dominion Cooperative. The purpose of the letter was, among other things, an attempt to bring home to the gentlemen addressed the fact that a charge for wheeling power at a rate of 1 mill had been used by VEPCO in the presentation of its case in opposition to the Old Dominion Electric Cooperative receiving approval at the hands of the State Corporation Commission of Virginia for a proposed loan that had been granted by the REA, and I quote from the letter:

In the Old Dominion proceeding before State corporation commission, Mr. Donald C. Barnes, chairman of its board, testified on June 22, 1950. At volume 11, page 1684 of the transcript will be found the reference to an exhibit which he that day filed. It was designated exhibit 170. This exhibit was a comparison of the costs of the VEPCO proposal of November 1949 and the Old Dominion plan. The VEPCO proposal of November 1949 contemplated that VEPCO should wheel the power from Buggs Island to the load centers of the cooperatives at a reasonable charge. In this exhibit the comparison of costs is based on certain assumptions and on page 2 of the exhibit this assumption is given:

"5. VEPCO would transmit energy purchased by the co-ops from Buggs Island and deliver at delivery points for 1 mill per kilowatt-hour."

Please bear in mind that this was not a proposed delivery to Old Dominion but a delivery to the 11 cooperatives constituting Old Dominion. On page 1, line 16 of the exhibit we find this entry: "Wheeling by VEPCO (line 6) at 1 mill per kilowatt-hour, \$161,364." That was for the year 1953. For the year 1953 it was estimated at \$243,665. The increase is accounted for by the expected increase in usage.

In other words, in showing what it would cost the cooperatives to buy the Government power and have it wheeled by VEPCO, VEPCO used and assumed a 1-mill wheeling charge as a fair and reasonable sum for wheeling. Mr. Barnes testified that "merely for the purpose of making an analysis I have used an assumed wheeling charge of 1 mill per kilowatt-hour for energy purchased by the co-ops from Buggs Island and transmitted by VEPCO." By using the 1-mill figure, the cost was naturally lower than if a higher figure had been used and the VEPCO offer naturally appeared in a more attractive light. That was the representation made to the Commission. That representation was again repeated on July 17, 1950 (transcript, vol. 13, p. 1822), when VEPCO filed exhibit 170A. The revised exhibit was to correct an inaccuracy in the original exhibit. However, the wheeling charge was left exactly the same.

Assumption No. 5 was not changed in any respect and the total wheeling charge was carried at \$161,364 for 1953 and \$243,665 for 1958, exactly the same as in the original exhibit. Therefore, twice the power company made a comparison of the costs under its proposal with the costs of the Old Dominion proposal and in each instance used a 1-mill wheeling charge as an essential element as the basis of the comparison of costs. If, in fact, the 1-mill wheeling charge was not fair and reasonable, then the power company had no justification for using it and its use constituted a representation calculated to bring about a wrong conclusion and a distortion of the facts.

There was no point in making a comparison unless the essentials on which the comparison was based were related to realities.

On April 26 I received a letter dated April 25, 1951, addressed to the two United States Senators from Virginia and all of the members of the Virginia delegation in the House from the Virginia REA Association and a number of electric cooperatives in Virginia, and I insert at this point the pertinent parts of that letter so that all of the Members of the House might have the benefit of the information contained therein:

RICHMOND, VA., April 25, 1951.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Hon. EDWARD J. ROBESON,
Hon. PORTER HARDY, Jr.,
Hon. J. VAUGHAN GARY,
Hon. WATKINS M. ABBITT,
Hon. THOS. B. STANLEY,
Hon. CLARENCE G. BURTON,
Hon. BURR P. HARRISON,
Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Hon. THOS. B. FUGATE,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The Virginia REA Association which is composed of all the electric co-operatives in Virginia has been meeting for the last 2 days in Richmond and we have been discussing our power problems.

These cooperatives serve various regions of Virginia, extending from the Eastern Shore to the Cumberland Gap and from Maryland to the North Carolina line. At present they have around 75,000 members. Providing electric service to this many rural people of Virginia distributed over this wide area imposes upon the officials of the cooperatives a very grave responsibility which they deeply feel and are anxious to discharge to the very best of their ability. Our farmers must have adequate service, their power supply must be adequate and their rates must be sufficiently low to enable them to make the best possible use of electric power and thereby efficiently operate their farms.

Since their organization beginning with 1936, the cooperatives have constantly encountered difficulties in securing adequate power at reasonable rates. Most of them at present purchase all of their power, some generate a portion of their power. Generally the cost of purchased power runs around 35 percent of the gross revenue of the cooperatives. This large percentage indicates how vital it is to the cooperatives that the cost of purchased power be reduced to a minimum.

Moreover, regardless of what anyone else may say, the fact is that generally our supply of power has been inadequate and the service has not been satisfactory.

In the Flood Control Act of 1944 Congress authorized the construction of a hydroelectric project at Buggs Island on the Roanoke River. In section 5 of that act Congress directed that preference in the sale of power generated at river developments shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives. The

Buggs Island development will come into operation in 1952 and the cooperatives are anxious to avail themselves of the preference rights which Congress has accorded them. This project was developed largely at the insistence of the rural people and over the strenuous opposition of the Virginia Electric & Power Co. Naturally our rural people feel that they should get the advantage of this development and the cooperatives have been and are doing everything in their power to see that this goal is realized.

Much has been said about the cost of Buggs Island power and the information given at the December 1950 meeting of the Senate Appropriations Committee was that the cost of power of Buggs Island would be 9.1 mills. That figure has been badly misunderstood. That represents, so we are informed, the total cost of the entire construction including flood control, pollution abatement, recreation and stream as well as power development. We are reliably informed that the cost to be allocated to power will only be a portion of the total cost and that the cost per kilowatt hour will be far less than the figure of 9.1 mills and will be less than 6½ mills at the bus bar.

The preference rights which Congress has granted the cooperatives can be of no use whatever to them unless they are able to get the power transmitted from Buggs Island to their load centers. This can be done in only three ways: First, by transmission facilities of the cooperatives themselves; second, by transmission facilities provided by the Government as set forth in the Flood Control Act and third, over the transmission facilities of VEPCO. So far the cooperatives have not been able to secure their own transmission lines, the State Corporation Commission of Virginia having rejected the Old Dominion application. So far VEPCO has refused to transmit or wheel the power to the cooperatives at a reasonable charge. Therefore the only remaining method by which the cooperatives can get this power is through the medium of Government transmission lines.

In December of 1950 Congress appropriated \$1,850,000 for the construction of a line from Buggs Island to Langley Field. That line will be so located that from it power can be made available to Mecklenburg Electric Cooperative, Southside Electric Cooperative, Community Electric Cooperative, and Prince George Electric Cooperative. These four cooperatives together have a membership of about 26,000 members.

In making the appropriation Congress proceeded on the assumption that the line in question would be built only if SEPA could not effect a reasonable wheeling arrangement with VEPCO for the transmission of the Government power to be produced at Buggs Island.

Extensive negotiations have taken place between Southeastern Power Administration and VEPCO with reference to the sale of power from Buggs Island and the cooperatives have been informed of the developments. The negotiations reached the point where the only two main differences between SEPA and VEPCO were first, whether SEPA should build any transmission lines from Buggs Island and deliver the power to VEPCO at points some distance from Buggs Island, and two, what fee or charge VEPCO should make SEPA for transmitting or wheeling the power to the preference consumers including the cooperatives.

SEPA insisted upon building limited transmission lines and delivering the power at points other than Buggs Island, while VEPCO insisted on bus bar delivery. VEPCO insisted on a wheeling charge based on zones—1 mill for 50 miles, 2 mills for 50 to 100 miles, 3 mills for a distance of 100 to 150 miles, and 4 mills for a distance of 150 to 200 miles. On the other hand SEPA contended for a flat wheeling charge of 1 mill.

There is good precedent for the 1 mill wheeling charge. This is the very charge which VEPCO used in exhibits 170 and 170A before the State corporation commission in the Old Dominion case showing what it would cost the 11 cooperatives which are Old Dominion members for having Government power wheeled from Buggs Island to their load centers. Eight of these load centers are in a 50-mile radius, 10 of them are in a 50- to 100-mile radius, 19 are in a radius of 100 to 150 miles, and 1 in the radius of 150 to 200 miles. The zoning wheeling proposal of VEPCO would average about 2½ mills for the cooperatives.

Also we are informed that recently Pacific Gas & Electric Co. negotiated a contract with the Bureau of Reclamation for the wheeling of power from Shasta Dam in California for distances up to 400 miles at a flat 1-mill wheeling fee.

In view of the deadlock between SEPA and VEPCO over the two major points of differences, the Virginia cooperatives urge SEPA to recede from its position that it build transmission lines from Buggs Island and to make bus bar delivery of the power to VEPCO provided VEPCO would wheel the power to the cooperatives at a flat 1 mill wheeling charge. SEPA agreed and this constituted a major victory for VEPCO which had vigorously opposed building of Government transmission lines. However, VEPCO refused on its part to agree to the 1 mill wheeling fee and the only concession which it would make was a reduction by ½ mill of the wheeling charge in each block, reducing it to ½ mill for the first zone, 1½ mills for the second zone, 2½ mills for the third zone and 3½ mills for the fourth zone. Obviously the purpose of VEPCO in refusing to agree to the flat 1 mill wheeling charge is to make the cost of wheeling so high that the cooperatives cannot avail themselves of Government power, and thereby putting VEPCO in a position to get all of the power on its own terms. At the same time it involved a concession on VEPCO's part of the rate for the wheeling charge for which it contended, but only to the very figure which it used in its presentation to the State corporation commission.

The representatives of the cooperatives hoped that this would constitute a fair compromise of the contending interests and would settle the power controversy in Virginia.

As applied to the cooperatives the effect of VEPCO's last proposal was to reduce the over-all wheeling fee from about 2.35 mills to 1.85 mills. Otherwise stated, its last figure was about double the 1 mill wheeling figure which it used in the Old Dominion case.

Apparently this deadlocked negotiations and there they hang. In view of this refusal of VEPCO to give and take, SEPA has proceeded with the staking of the lines.

We wish to make it crystal clear that the cooperatives are not interested in Government transmission lines except to the extent that the building of such lines or appropriations for the building thereof will make it possible for the cooperatives to get the benefit of Buggs Island power at reasonable wheeling rates for the farmers of Virginia. The cooperatives believe that the only way by which VEPCO can be induced to listen to reason is for the Government to continue the appropriation for the lines from Buggs Island to Langley Field.

We call your attention to the fact that by doubling the 1 mill wheeling charge the cooperatives in 1953 will have to pay about \$160,000 more for that 1 year than VEPCO estimated in the exhibit which it filed with the State corporation commission; and taking the expected usage for 1958 the additional cost will be around \$240,000 for that year alone. We trust that these figures will convey some idea of the tremendous stake

which the cooperatives have in securing a reasonable wheeling arrangement.

Mr. Chairman, if the facts are as stated in these letters we will see that the figure of 1 mill has been used by VEPCO on several occasions in working out its position in matters effecting the cost of wheeling of power from Buggs Island dam to the rural areas. This morning I received another letter dated April 28, 1951 addressed to Messrs. BURR P. HARRISON, PORTER HARDY, JR., THOMAS B. FUGATE, and myself, from the attorney of the REA association in Virginia. Under permission granted, I am inserting the pertinent parts of that letter here:

APRIL 28, 1951.

MESSRS. BURR P. HARRISON, PORTER HARDY, JR., W. M. ABBITT, and THOMAS B. FUGATE, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: If you are in doubt as to why the co-ops look with skepticism on the various statements and proposals of VEPCO, we ask that you turn to the RECORD.

In May, 1949, in the Roanoke Rapids case (project 2009) Mr. J. G. Holtzclaw, president of the company, testified. He was being pressed on why his company was charging the co-ops a rate of 10 mills per kilowatt hour. He stated: "But for the fact that so large a part of the company's generating plant was built when construction costs were about half what they are now, a 1-cent rate would not be possible." And he further said that the 10 mill (1 cent) rate was "about as low as rates go on a system such as ours with coal at about \$10 per ton." That was in May, 1949. That was before REA granted Old Dominion the loan of 14 million plus dollars.

When VEPCO found out that REA was seriously considering making the loan, it made the co-ops offers in September, 1949, only 4 months later to sell at a new rate (based on demand plus energy) averaging around 9 mills, or about 10 percent less than in May.

When REA actually made the loan, VEPCO asked it to reconsider the application and deny it, and the basis for its request was a second offer to the co-ops—made September 30, 1949—to sell at the reduced rate until Government river developments began generation, and then to wheel the Government power to the co-ops and sell them what they needed in addition to what they could get from the Government at 7½ mills. This is known as contract 408-Va. But the co-ops stood firm and would not bite.

In December 1949 Old Dominion filed its application for authority to issue its securities for the loan with State corporation commission. VEPCO was permitted to intervene, and did so. It filed its petition to intervene, which was sworn to by its president, Mr. Holtzclaw, on January 23, 1950—only 8 months after his testimony in Washington before the Federal Power Commission. In paragraph 15 of that petition this is what he swore to:

"Moreover, by virtue of recent economies of operation from the new and efficient generating units, VEPCO was able to, and did, offer the electric cooperatives an improved rate schedule that would effect a reduction of approximately 10 percent."

Thus, according to the sworn statements of Mr. Holtzclaw, VEPCO's rates would have to be even higher if it were not for the fact that a large part of its plant was built before the war. But it can afford a substantial rate reduction because so much of its plant was built after the war.

In addition, when it was charging the co-ops 10 mills it was just about cost; in fact, Mr. Holtzclaw also testified in May 1949, on cross-examination, that VEPCO was suffering from the 10-mill rate. But when its other

proposals were not accepted it came up with a flat 7½-mill rate offer in April 1950.

With that record staring us in the face, we insist that we are thoroughly justified in being skeptical. All we ask is that you put yourselves in the positions of the co-ops' directors and officers and attorneys, and ask yourselves what you would think if you were in their shoes.

I also insert at this point copy of the telegram from Mr. J. G. Holtzclaw, president of the Virginia Electric & Power Co., addressed to the Honorable J. VAUGHAN GARY and dated April 27, 1951:

RICHMOND, VA., April 27, 1951.

Hon. J. VAUGHAN GARY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

You stated on the floor of the House on April 24, at page 4397 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and repeated at page 4403, that VEPCO had offered to accept the wheeling charges contained in any major contract covering wheeling and firming of power that had so far been approved by Interior Department. I understand that Pacific Gas & Electric Co. contract is being urged by electric cooperatives and Rural Electrification Administration as meeting this condition. We have studied the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. contract and find it wholly inapplicable to the SEPA-VEPCO situation because it provides for no firming of Government power with steam generated power without which the Buggs Island high peaking capacity would be of little value and because the Government loads in the California case are highly concentrated, 90 percent of the existing loads being within 50 miles of the Government's delivery point at Tracy, Calif., as compared to the widely scattered Government loads, most of them far removed from Buggs Island, to be served in the VEPCO service area. This Pacific contract is a contract to wheel only. We reaffirm that we will wheel to SEPA's customers for the wheeling charges contained in any major contract covering wheeling and firming of power. Specifically we would accept the wheeling charges in the Montana transmission service contract (Fort Peck), the Colorado contract, the Oklahoma contract or the Texas Power & Light contract. VEPCO is willing to wheel power to SEPA's customers at its average transmission cost. SEPA has rejected VEPCO's suggestion that this cost be determined by the Federal Power Commission. VEPCO reaffirms that offer and makes this further suggestion as a possible means of resolving the matter: That this cost be determined by a panel of three experts—one to be appointed by SEPA, one to be appointed by VEPCO and the third to be the chief of the Power Bureau of the Federal Power Commission. We are sending a copy of this telegram to Mr. Creim as a definite proposal to SEPA.

J. G. HOLTZCLAW,
President, Virginia Electric & Power Co.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, this is the old struggle between public and private ownership. The amendment on the desk is very much in line with my own thinking on the question of public power.

The gentleman from New Mexico a few minutes ago charged me with being in favor of private enterprise except at Niagara, or the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I did not charge that; I did suggest that the gentleman was against public development of the St. Lawrence seaway. I remind the gentleman that Charles Wilson made the statement that it was a good proposition

and that he could get the money as quick as that from private enterprise.

The gentleman knows I am very much in favor of development of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. DONDERO. Under the basic law of our country the Federal Government claims to own and dominates all navigable water. Wherever it is possible to develop power by the Federal Government I think it should be done because of excessive and increasing demand for power.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Even though that money comes from private industry?

Mr. DONDERO. Where we differ, and where we part company is where the Federal Government attempts after it produces the power to build transmission lines from various projects from the dam or place of generation of electric energy in competition with private investment and private enterprise.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Does not that occur in this project all the way through?

Mr. DONDERO. Just a moment, wherever private enterprise, or private ownership cannot or will not transmit the power generated, then and then only, I am in favor of the Federal Government entering that field. If it is possible to have private enterprise develop the power in the St. Lawrence seaway I am and would be for it.

Now, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] mentioned the power at Niagara and the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I have heard the gentleman mention it several times; I got most of my information from him.

Mr. DONDERO. It so happens that I heard the testimony on the Niagara power matter and the gentleman has heard the testimony, like myself, in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway. Never before in the history of this Nation has the Federal Government entered the power field at Niagara; every kilowatt of power that has been generated there has been generated by private enterprise with private capital. Under the recent treaty made between Canada and the United States it is provided that the Federal Government should proceed to generate power from the extra water allocated to the United States out of the Niagara River. That is a matter of record.

The gentleman says, and I agree with him, that private enterprise is perfectly willing to generate the power at Niagara. The Niagara-Mohawk Power Co. has offered to invest every dollar necessary to generate whatever power that additional water will produce. That is also a matter of record. The Federal Government would not have to invest a dollar. Why not let private enterprise do it?

Now, in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway, we face an international situation there. I would like to see private enterprise, private investment put in every dollar that is necessary and develop that power. However, there is an international question: water owned by two governments. The St. Lawrence River is the international boundary. I do not know whether or not it is possible to do it through private enterprise.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I do not see why we cannot do it. Mr. Wilson said it was a good investment, and he could get the money that quick. That is not the only question. It would be a big corporation, and the Government, the Federal Government, would get 45 percent of the income if they declared dividends, and they would declare dividends, and when they did the Government would take another bite of 30 to 50 percent from the stockholders. Is not that a grand investment for the Federal Government? Why do we mess with it?

Mr. DONDERO. I agree with the gentleman that it would be a good money-maker for the Federal Government, but because of the international questions involved I do not know that it can be handled by private enterprise.

My good friend from Washington, the able gentleman [Mr. JACKSON], said there would be no competition in the making of a contract with a monopoly.

I want to remind the gentleman that, in my opinion, the greatest monopoly in this country today is big government rather than big business. If it is so desirable that the Government step in and take away from private investment and private enterprise every field where they can go and pay taxes, why not extend that to all the other activities of the American people? But when you do that you bring Russia to America, and the Republic of the United States vanishes. I am opposed to that philosophy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I would like to comment on the remarks of my good friend by saying that I am not opposed to business, I am not opposed to big government for a big country like America, nor am I opposed to big business as such. If they do a good job, they have a legitimate place in a free society, which is in keeping with the best of our traditions. The thing I cannot understand on the part of the gentleman's reasoning is this: He says it is all right for the Government to build these dams in given situations, and I refer to the big dams.

Mr. DONDERO. That is because we control the water. Private enterprise cannot do that unless given a license by the Federal Government.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Private utilities throughout America for years and years have had the opportunity to apply for a license to build dams, but they did not see fit to do so until Uncle Sam showed them how to make money by building dams so that they could buy power in order to sell to more and more customers. It is because of

their lack of foresight. Was Teddy Roosevelt, were all of the Republican administrations wrong in saying that when we build a Government project the preferred customers, namely the municipalities and the public bodies throughout America, should have preference in buying that power? Is the gentleman opposed to that philosophy?

Mr. DONDERO. I am opposed to the Federal Government making a contract when private enterprise stands ready to make the same kind of contract with public bodies.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. What kind of a contract? The crux of this issue is whether we are going to have a fair contract at a fair rate in wheeling the power from the dams to the preferred customers. I would like to know whether the gentleman is opposed to the preference provisions of the law?

Mr. DONDERO. I am opposed to the preference provisions of the law unless that same preference is given to private enterprise to serve public bodies which you insist on the Federal Government doing. That is the only difference between us.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I take it that the gentleman then wants a preference clause that is not a preference clause. He wants to put the private utilities on the same basis as the preferred customers in connection with power from Government-owned projects?

Mr. DONDERO. Where the Government produces the power and private enterprise stands ready and willing to distribute that power at a rate fixed by the Government itself, private enterprise should have the right to do it.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Is the gentleman referring to the wheeling arrangements? I do not understand his statement. He says that where the private utilities or private companies are willing to deliver the power, I do not quite follow him. Does the gentleman say that if the Government cannot get a fair and decent contract with the private utility to wheel its own power from its own dams to its own customers, it cannot go ahead and build transmission lines?

Mr. DONDERO. How could a situation arise that would be otherwise than a fair contract when the Government agency itself controls the rate making or the price to be paid for power?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. There is no question of rate making involved. Wheeling contracts do not come within the provisions of the Federal Power Commission. It is not within the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. The gentleman is referring to the wholesaling and retailing of power which is within the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. I just want to straighten the gentleman out on the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. I want to ask the gentleman from Washington one question. Does the gentleman mean to say to the House and to the country that private enterprise was not willing to wheel that power on transmission lines already constructed just as cheap and just as reasonable as the Government itself could do it?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Of course, I will say to my good friend from Michigan that we have spent hours and days here debating that very point. That is just exactly it. We have not been able to, in many instances, in case after case, where the private utilities have been unwilling to enter into those agreements. The gentleman has witnessed the colloquy here this afternoon; an unusual situation. Last week we had an offer by the Virginia Electric & Power Co. making a new proposal. Now today, as this debate goes on we hear it made, and I am sure in another 2 months we will have the final contract entered into, if we can keep it going, because this week there is another proposal that is about to be consummated with the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. The whole point, to answer the gentleman's question, is that many utilities will agree to fair and reasonable wheeling rates, but there are a lot of utility companies that will not do that, and that is why we have item after item in this bill—I do not know whether we will by the time we are through—to build those lines where the private utility companies will not build the lines, and we are trying to give Uncle Sam just sufficient bargaining power to enter into contracts that will provide fair, just, and equitable wheeling rates.

Mr. DONDERO. May I say to the gentleman on the general subject of production of power by private utilities versus the Government, that if we are to believe Mr. Burton, chairman of the New York Power Authority, he admitted to our committee that if private enterprise and private investment were relieved from the burden of taxation, they could produce power just as cheap as the Federal Government. Private industry pays taxes and the Federal Government does not. I am opposed to public power when private enterprise can do it.

(Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to revise and extend my remarks and that the pending amendment be reread by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(The Clerk again read the amendment.)

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, that amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's point of order comes too late. The amendment had been read some several minutes ago.

Mr. RANKIN. I thought they were reading it for the first time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asked unanimous consent that the amendment be reread.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi has spoken on the amendment and did not know the subject matter when he heard it read. I sat here attentatively and listened to the gentleman from Virginia talking off the subject of this amendment for some 45 minutes, and then we had the St. Lawrence seaway debate.

Mr. RANKIN. Before the gentleman makes that kind of a statement—

Mr. WERDEL. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is wrong in that statement.

Mr. WERDEL. I am somewhat surprised that this committee does not accept this amendment. Each and all of the members of the committee have said that they do not want to do what this amendment provides that the Bureau of Reclamation cannot do. We are not talking about Virginia or any other subject other than the appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation. When we talk about duplicating power lines in this amendment we are talking about the West and the State of California, and I mention that because there are other gentlemen in the House from the State of California who should know that would be the subject of the amendment of the gentleman from New York. I pointed out to you in previous remarks the reasons I am opposed to unnecessary power lines. The Central Valley project is a multiple-purpose project. The cost of water depends on what reasonably can be obtained from the sale of power. Here are the facts so far as this amendment is concerned and what it will do. There is a wheeling agreement in California with private industry over an area 200 miles wide and 500 miles long. That agreement was entered into on the 2d day of April after the Bureau of the Budget made a recommendation for power lines. That agreement was made after the hearings closed in the committee. The committee expressed itself as waiting to see whether or not such an agreement was made. That agreement provides that power will be wheeled any place in an area 200 miles wide and 500 miles long for a basic rate of 1 mill a kilowatt-hour. That contract has to be agreed to by the public utilities commission of the State of California. It will look at it in the interests of other power users of that utility company. The bill now provides for short power lines to be built by the Bureau in order that it may serve directly the more favorably situated customers, thus increasing the cost to the utility by increasing the average distance power is to be transported. This subject was considered by both the Bureau and the utility when they signed the agreement providing a reasonable wheeling charge. The Bureau should live up to its contract and place the utility in the position of increasing its wheeling costs to other outlying Government customers.

Imagine, within 2 weeks after they entered into the agreement, here is the Bureau with lines in the bill, and this committee, opposing this amendment

and doing it without any definite statement of purpose.

This is what happens in California. This bill has in it \$1,656,478 of money today. It will authorize the eventual expenditure of an estimated \$11,000,000. The requested lines are to service areas within that area embraced by the contract. Less than a month ago, the Bureau and the utility agreed upon a reasonable rate to furnish any lines that it now has or may need to perform the obligations to deliver to Government agencies or preferred customers. The contract binds the utility to deliver even if it requires new construction.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about unnecessary lines because they are duplicated and because an executed contract makes them unnecessary. Yet the committee recommendation without explanation requires using 5,000 tons of steel—three trainloads, 1,000,000 pounds of aluminum, and about 300 tons of copper to create facilities not the equal of those already in existence and available to the Government.

Mr. Chairman, this is at the expense of the water-users in the State of California. The only possible purpose, if you please, is to take power lines from a Government project under the guise of preferred customers and run it to some area in California where some Republican or Democrat may want to go politically. Such definition of preferred customers will kill reclamation. I think the committee had better take another look at its yardstick.

Adoption of this amendment would, for example, prevent the Bureau of Reclamation from constructing the following facilities in the Central Valley project area in California where a power-wheeling service contract has been executed:

Keswick-Shasta Dam area PUD transmission line and substation, 115 kilovolts.

Folsom - Elverta - Sacramento - Folsom loop line and substation, 115 kilovolts.

Elverta-Sacramento switchyards.

Tracy-Livermore-Ames transmission line and substations, 115 kilovolts.

Tracy-Contra Costa-Clayton-Ygnacio transmission line and substations extension, 69 kilovolts.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, the Keating amendment provides in substance that no money in this bill shall be spent for transmission facilities within an area covered by existing wheeling contracts which make provision for service to Federal installations and preference customers.

The fallacy of this amendment is that the present wheeling contract in California provides only for the wheeling of power over the existing facilities of the utility. There is nothing in the contract that requires the utility to build additional facilities in order to make the wheeling possible.

For instance, this appropriation bill contains a provision for the construction of the Tracy-Livermore-Ames transmission line. Additional facilities will be required to carry this load which serves a defense installation. Because of the low

load factor the utility will not build the line unless it is financed by the Government. That is the contract now offered. In other words the Government puts up the money and the utility owns the line. And this line will not be built unless a separate agreement is made. But this amendment will take away any bargaining power the Government might have in getting a contract at a fair rate. The Government under this amendment cannot build the line. Therefore the Government—and necessarily the defense installation—is at the mercy of the utility. That is not fair, and certainly not the result intended by this Congress.

Since the amendment only prohibits the initiation of new transmission facilities it will not interrupt the completion of the west side transmission line in the Central Valley of California, or the Keswick-SPAUD line which is already started. But, there can be no start on the Folsom-Elverta line which is also provided for in this bill. In this instance a connection by the utility costing a million dollars will be necessary. But what assurance does Congress have that the connection will be made? And if it is made it will cost the Government 1 mill per kilowatt to wheel all the power from the Folsom Dam now under construction a distance of 20 miles to an interconnection with the Government's own transmission system. That is too expensive and a waste of the taxpayers' money.

Another item provided for in this bill is the Tracy-Contra Costa-Clayton-Ygnacio transmission line and substations. The existing lines pass over the Government camp and preference customers to be served by these facilities. Only substations are required. But this amendment would prohibit the building of those facilities. The Government will be stuck with a 1 mill rate for serving these customers including its own camp; that is an excessive rate for customers located in the shadow of the Government's own lines. All it will take to serve them is a little line and a substation, but under the terms of this amendment that cannot be done. And it will be costly to the taxpayers because the Government will pay for the unnecessary service rendered by the utility.

The Government should retain the power to construct transmission lines where authorized by Congress. We should not strait-jacket the Government in any such a manner as this. This amendment destroys the bargaining power of the Government, and puts it at the mercy of the utility. If there is a reasonable argument against any of the lines appropriated for in this bill, the argument—and the amendment—should strike at those lines specifically; but a general amendment like this operates equally against all transmission facilities in our State, and in addition ties the hands of the Government in bargaining for the wheeling of power which will require the building of additional facilities as will be the case in most instances.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JACKSON of Washington) there were—ayes 87, noes 62.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KEATING and Mr. JACKSON of Washington.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 118, noes 78.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof and of other facilities, as authorized by law; and for a soil- and moisture-conservation program on lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant to law, \$15,385,000, of which not to exceed \$12,883,900 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and not to exceed \$1,671,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River dam fund: *Provided*, That funds advanced for operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation, and may be expended for the same objects and in the same manner as sums appropriated herein may be expended, and the unexpended balances of such advances shall be credited to the appropriation for the next succeeding fiscal year: *Provided further*, That after December 31, 1951, no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for payment of the cost of operation and maintenance of Imperial Dam and the All-American Canal and appurtenant works to and including Pilot Knob check and wasteway (engineer station 1098) for the purpose of diversion or carriage of water for any water user, district, or association unless and until arrangements, satisfactory to the Secretary, shall have been made for payment annually to the United States of the part of such cost allocable to such water user, district, or association.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS: On page 16 beginning with line 10, strike out lines 10 to 24, inclusive, and on page 17 strike out lines 1 to 10, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof and of other facilities, as authorized by law; and for a soil- and moisture-conservation program on lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant to law, \$15,094,000, of which not to exceed \$12,592,900 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and not to exceed \$1,671,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River dam fund: *Provided*, That funds advanced for operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and may be expended for the same objects and in the same manner as sums appropriated herein may be expended, and the unexpended balances of such advances shall be credited to the appropriation for the next succeeding fiscal year."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, we accept that amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURDOCK to the amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS: On page 16, at the end of the amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS insert: "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for operation and maintenance of any irrigation works in excess of repayments during the current fiscal year pursuant to law."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is in effect legislation on an appropriation bill, and therefore a violation of rule 21.

I make the further point of order, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona to my amendment purports to be a limitation but is in effect an authorization. There is no authorization at the present time for expenditures, from the funds to which the gentleman refers, for operation and maintenance of these certain projects. Therefore, if the gentleman from Arizona offers an amendment which says, "You must not spend more than that amount of money," then it is in effect not a limitation but an authorization for the expenditure of money to that point.

If the Chairman would hear me in language which is not legal, I could perhaps make it very clear in simple language. Suppose the Chairman had in his pocket, as trustee, \$100, which was to be applied to the building fund of a church. It was for that purpose. Now, suppose the gentleman from Arizona got up and said "You must not spend more than \$50 of that for a new suit for yourself." That is an analogous situation. There is no money authorized to be spent in the bill for the purpose for which the gentleman from Arizona attempts to set a limitation. Therefore, I hold first that this is subject to a point of order; and, of course, should it not be subject to a point of order, I would of course hope that the amendment would not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, that has nothing to do with whether it is germane or subject to a point of order.

The Chair would be glad to hear the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] if he desires to be heard.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do desire to be heard, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that this is nothing but a negative limitation on an appropriation. The precedents of the House are replete with decisions holding negative limitations on appropriations to be in order.

If you will look at the wording of the amendment, and that is all that is required in making a parliamentary decision on the matter, it applies solely to this one appropriation under consideration, that for operation and maintenance of reclamation projects. It does not operate beyond the fiscal year for which the appropriation is made. No affirmative directions are given by the amendment to anyone, and it does not impose any additional duties on anyone. It in

no way changes existing law, and it does not alter, modify, or extend any existing powers.

All the amendment does is to say you cannot spend this appropriation in excess of the amounts which are repaid when the law is complied with. It does not require repayment from anyone—it does require anyone to comply with the law.

The reclamation law is based entirely on the concept of repayment, both of construction costs and costs of annual operation and maintenance. Title 43 of the United States Code has so many provisions requiring repayment of operation and maintenance costs, that I would not know which one to cite first.

All this amendment does is to say that this appropriation, which covers operation and maintenance of all federally built reclamation projects, can be expended in not to exceed the amounts equal to the collections made in compliance with the law.

I maintain that the point of order cannot lie against this language.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] offers an amendment which the clerk has reported to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. The gentleman from California makes a point of order against the amendment for the reasons which he has stated.

The Chair has had an opportunity to examine the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California. The Chair has concluded that the amendment is clearly a limitation, negative in character on an appropriation bill. The amendment limits in a negative manner the amount which can be spent only during the fiscal year covered by the bill presently before the Committee.

The device by which the limitation of the amount is determined is the extent to which the law is complied with. It does not add to the requirements of any law; it does not require compliance with any law; all it does is to say that you may spend this appropriation up to the amount that the law requiring repayment is complied with. The amendment therefore is in order and the Chair overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from California.

The gentleman from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, if there is one principle underlying the reclamation law it is the principle of repayment of the investment the Government makes in that reclamation project. When we come before you as I have been accustomed to doing for many years asking for authorization and appropriations for reclamation projects I have continually pointed out that the money spent by Uncle Sam in the investment is repayable. There has been a good deal of argument about that and sometimes it is a little hard to impress that fact upon the Members of Congress who do not quite understand as we westerners do the great value and wealth-cre-

ating possibilities of reclamation as a national investment.

I would not at any time sanction, countenance, or look Members of Congress in the face and ask for money to be appropriated either to build or to operate a reclamation project unless I felt that the existing law requiring repayment would be complied with. That is all that I am trying to do in this amendment to the Phillips amendment. If there are reclamation projects where operation and maintenance costs have not been repaid, they ought, in fairness to all other reclamation projects and to the cause of reclamation to be required to pay operation and maintenance charges. That repayment should be done within the fiscal year in which the appropriation is made. That is the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Since the matter stated by the gentleman in his amendment is already in the law, and since, presumably, the Government agencies are required to comply with the law, why is the amendment necessary? I cannot understand the purpose of it. Why should the gentleman be putting something in this law that is the law already and has to be complied with?

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman himself knows that the law is not always complied with. This brings the Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior and every other agency connected with the handling of this appropriation to task to see that the law is complied with.

Mr. ENGLE. Do I understand the gentleman is merely restating the law in order to emphasize that to be sure the Bureau of Reclamation will have it called to their attention so that they will enforce it.

Mr. MURDOCK. We want it enforced. Mr. ENGLE. Does the gentleman believe this amendment has any particular adaptation to the Imperial irrigation district in California and, if so, what?

Mr. MURDOCK. It may apply to projects in my own State. I do not know whether the irrigation projects in my own State have paid their operation and maintenance charges. If they have not they ought to do so, and that applies to anything in California or in any other of the 15 western States, in addition to Arizona and California.

Mr. ENGLE. I agree with all that, but the gentleman has not answered the question. I asked him whether or not he believes this amendment has any particular application to the Imperial irrigation district in California?

Mr. MURDOCK. If the Imperial irrigation district in California has not paid its operation and maintenance charges, it should be required to do so, and that applies to all the other nearly 300 Federally owned projects in the country.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman still has not answered the question. Does he believe this amendment has any particular

application to the Imperial irrigation district in California?

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. This amendment, as I understand it, would not be applicable to any district unless they were not repaying the full amount of the Federal money that went into that project.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is right.

Mr. NORRELL. May I say to the committee that I recognize the gentleman's great statesmanship. The people of the United States should appreciate the services of the gentleman from Arizona today. I have always recognized him to be interested in reclamation, as I am. Reclamation is as safe as the Rock of Gibraltar as long as these repayment contracts are held sacred and inviolate. I want to congratulate the gentleman for his amendment. I think it ought to be adopted.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I concur, of course, in the statement made by my distinguished colleague from Arkansas in regard to the great service rendered by the gentleman from Arizona; but I am trying to find out whether or not there is a curve on this one.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. I asked the gentleman whether or not this amendment had any particular application to the Imperial irrigation district in California. The gentleman has not answered. Now, may I ask: Does the gentleman agree that the Imperial irrigation district has a binding contract with the Federal Government whereunder it has to pay its own maintenance and operation and take care of that without any appropriation at all from the Federal Government?

Mr. MURDOCK. I cannot say as to that. I do know they have a contract with the Government which needs amending. I simply maintain that if there are reclamation projects that have not been paying their operation and maintenance costs annually within the fiscal year, they ought to be required to do so and my amendment will make them do so. Of course, that also would apply to the Imperial irrigation district.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that my amendment be adopted.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the original amendment which I introduced affects the bill at page 15 by taking \$291,000 out of each

of the two figures in line 14 and striking the last proviso which begins in line 24. It has no further effect on the paragraph.

Several days ago a related amendment was adopted which struck out on page 14, line 20, the words "and treaties." The reason for all this is lengthy and I shall endeavor to shorten it. The gentleman from Arizona, by his apparent unwillingness to answer the questions asked by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], has in effect shown you what the situation is. Under the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928, which was reported in House Document 717, Eightieth Congress, the Imperial irrigation district was protected in the right to pay the operation and maintenance cost of the canal and this contract was entered into December 1, 1932, and there is no authorization, and there is no reason for any money to be put in this bill or any other bill as an appropriation to pay the operation and maintenance of the All-American Canal. Later, this was under discussion in the Senate when the Mexico Water Treaty, the United States-Mexican agreement, was under discussion, and by a specific limitation upon that treaty which, as I recall, is reservation C—they were numbered A, B, and C—it was again said that that treaty should in no way abrogate any contract which provided for the payment—and I put it in my own language—by the Imperial irrigation district for the operation and maintenance of the canal. The agreement between the irrigation district and the Federal Government contained the following, and I quote:

The district shall, at its own cost and without expense to the United States, care for, operate, and maintain the same—

And so forth, which is all part of the agreement. Now, there was an attempt to write into the bill this year, I think due to a misunderstanding, a provision which would have put \$291,000 in the bill for operation and maintenance paid for by the Federal Government and, by other wording, to give authorization for that expenditure. I submitted an amendment to strike that out, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], after consultation, was kind enough to accept it without argument. The gentleman and I hoped that this longer argument would not take place.

This does not affect the State of Arizona; it only affects the State of California. The gentleman from Arizona is bypassing his own committee, because when you have an authorization problem it should go before a legislative committee, and he is attempting, acting as a sort of carrier pigeon for the Bureau of Reclamation to add to my amendment what would seem to be a restriction but which is, in effect, an implied authorization for the expenditure of money which is not otherwise authorized. This little matter of a district to pay within a year, of course, we all agree to; there is no argument over that. Last November, the Secretary of the Interior, without a hearing, and acting entirely on his own authority, made a finding, as he called it, that it was for the best inter-

ests of the country that these contracts which had been made between the United States and an irrigation district should be set aside and the Bureau should operate this canal itself. That is what the gentleman from Arizona is attempting to put into the bill by indirection and that is what I hope you, Mr. Chairman, and the Members of the Congress will refuse to accept as an amendment, and thus we will simply be adopting the amendment which I offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from California, whose subcommittee, by the way, is the one which should have this matter before it for consideration, and we would be very glad to present the case to them.

Mr. ENGLE. Do I understand that at the present time there is no authorization for the Bureau of Reclamation to operate the All-American Canal?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. Under a contract the Imperial irrigation district expects to pay for it?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. This means the American taxpayers do not have to put up a dime?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. Does the gentleman interpret this amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona to be an indirect method of getting a foot in the door to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to operate this canal at the expense of the taxpayers generally rather than at the expense of the Imperial irrigation district?

Mr. PHILLIPS. If I did not suspect that, I would see no point whatever in the amendment being offered.

Mr. ENGLE. In other words, the gentleman does not regard this as just pleasantries with existing law being reiterated in an appropriation bill; he sees some devious purpose in it? Is that it?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Having just taken out three devious purposes before this one was suggested, I am naturally a little bit suspicious.

Mr. ENGLE. I will be frank to tell the gentleman that I cannot see how the proposed amendment does what the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] thinks it does, but I share some of his suspicions about it.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that the Imperial irrigation district has agreed in writing that it will take over this project according to the original agreement and live up to the water

treaty between the United States and Mexico, and that any time they do not live up to that agreement the Bureau of Reclamation may cancel their contract?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct. We have so signed that contract. We have been supported by the Department of State. It was only on November 7, 1950, that Secretary Chapman, without any hearings or any consultation and in violation of article 24 of this contract between the United States and the Imperial district, made this determination:

It is my determination that, within the framework of the foregoing interpretation of article 23 of the treaty, the only method by which the Department of the Interior can assure the necessary ownership, control, and jurisdiction required by the treaty (in connection with water deliveries to Mexico) is through the operation and maintenance by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Imperial Dam and the All-American Canal from Imperial Dam to and including the Pilot Knob check and wasteway.

We have the money. We are most anxious to assume the responsibility and the cost of operation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

(Mr. MURDOCK and Mr. PHILLIPS asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.)

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. These are the questions I want to ask: Who has controlled and operated the Imperial Dam and the first section of the All-American Canal in recent years?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think that up to the time of the contract, and up to the time it was supposed to be finished and turned over to Imperial irrigation district, it had been operated as a construction project, as any canal would be operated during construction by the the constructing agency, which was the Bureau. The Department has refused to turn it over.

Mr. MURDOCK. The question is answered. The Bureau of Reclamation has operated this dam and the first section of the canal since it has been ready for use.

Mr. PHILLIPS. During its construction.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is technically still in construction?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes. The Bureau will not declare it completed. We want it declared ended, so we can start paying back some money.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is only one question. I have some others.

Mr. PHILLIPS. All right.

Mr. MURDOCK. How much water has the Imperial Diversion Dam diverted into California and carried to the Imperial irrigation district in the past 10 years of record?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I cannot give the gentleman that. Maybe the gentleman can give it for me.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. I can give it myself.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Then give it to me.

Mr. MURDOCK. More than 25,000,000 acre-feet of water have been delivered in the past 10 years of record from the Imperial Diversion Dam for use in irrigation in the Imperial Valley. Can the gentleman tell me the total cash crop produced in the Imperial Valley with those 25,000,000 acre-feet of water?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes; I could, but what has that to do with this? Do not forget that some of that water may have been delivered at the request of the Department of State and some of it I know was delivered in order that constructive use might be made of the water rather than see it wasted.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want this in the Record. Not only have 25,000,000 acre-feet of water been delivered to the Imperial irrigation district, but with that 25,000,000 acre-feet during the past 10 years that garden spot has produced more than \$760,000,000 worth of cash agricultural products. That is an impressive production record. Surely during those years the district could have paid a large part of its repayment obligation to the Government.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It cost us something to raise it, did it not?

Mr. MURDOCK. That is right, I am talking about the gross production. Has the Imperial irrigation district paid one red cent on its construction cost?

Mr. PHILLIPS. It has been trying to, but we cannot get the Bureau to live up to the contract.

Mr. MURDOCK. Has the Imperial irrigation district paid anything on its operational costs during these 10 years?

Mr. PHILLIPS. It was not supposed to. The gentleman is the chairman of the committee, and he knows very well that no irrigation district begins its payments until a certain time after the construction is finished.

Mr. MURDOCK. Now the gentleman is hanging on to a technicality. That project has been completed for more than 10 years.

Mr. PHILLIPS. No.

Mr. MURDOCK. It has been in full operation and the project has not been paying its way and has not been paying its operating cost and it has not been paying on its construction costs. That is the thing the Congress ought to look into. I know about your contract and I will have something to say about that in the extension of my remarks.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There is nothing that our people would like better than to have this Congress look into, and you may find some very surprising things. I will say for the benefit of my friend, the gentleman from Arizona, I am afraid the amendment he is offering to my amendment would come back to haunt him, in connection with some Arizona projects much more than it would ever come back to haunt the Imperial irrigation district.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. What conceivable application can this amendment have to the Imperial irrigation district, when the Imperial irrigation district is paying its own maintenance and operation costs?

Mr. PHILLIPS. As I remarked, having just stricken out three somewhat similar provisions, of which it was the very obvious intent to get a foot in the door, I may be a little overly suspicious. We might very well get along without the amendment, but I cannot see that it does any good.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, my amendment having been voted down still needs some further explanation. It is unfortunate that a matter as important as this cannot be more fully explained. The gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] very shrewdly guessed that the language of my amendment might have some connection with the Imperial irrigation district. That was not such a shrewd guess, after all, when it is seen that the language on page 17 which was eliminated by the Phillips amendment did pertain specifically to the Imperial irrigation district. It was not that I wanted to be evasive, that I did not name the Imperial irrigation district, but that I wanted it clearly understood that my amendment was general in its nature and applied to all and every one of the Federal reclamation projects requiring them to obey the law and to pay operation and maintenance charges according to law within each fiscal year covered by an appropriation. As I said, out of the nearly 300 Federal reclamation projects in the West, there may be several which have not been paying the operation and maintenance charges but should be held to account to do so.

As I sat here listening to the further debate on my amendment, I have been asked, "Is it true that the Imperial irrigation district has not been paying the cost of operation and maintenance?" One colleague asked, "Is it true that the Imperial irrigation district has not been paying annually for the cost of construction of their facilities by the Bureau of Reclamation?" These two questions, as a matter of fact, I regret to say, must be answered in the affirmative. There may be extenuating circumstances which in all fairness to this great irrigation district should be explained. I want to be fair and truthful, and therefore I will try briefly to explain the situation.

As a matter of fact it is my information from an authoritative source: first, that the Imperial irrigation district has not paid Uncle Sam any part of the cost of building the Imperial Dam and the All-American canal down to the Mexican border, although they have a con-

tract to repay the Government the entire cost in about 40 annual payments. I cannot say concerning any repayments to the Government for the cost of that part of the All-American canal from Pilot Knob westwardly in California into Imperial Valley. I am discussing here the Imperial diversion dam and that first section of the All-American canal from the diversion dam down through California to Pilot Knob on the Mexican border. Let me repeat, it is my information that the Imperial irrigation district of California has not to date paid a dollar on its construction cost.

I was present in October 1938 when Secretary Ickes opened the gates of the Imperial diversion dam and turned water into the All-American Canal. I understand there was some trouble in the use of the canal for several months, and that it cannot be said to have been usable until about 1940. However, for all intents and purposes it has been completed and it has been in use, virtually full use, for 9 or 10 years of record. The Bureau of Reclamation has operated the dam and canal down to Pilot Knob. It costs money to operate such facilities. It is my understanding that during these 9 or 10 years the Imperial irrigation district has not currently paid these operation and maintenance charges, but instead they have accumulated and been held in abeyance against the time when other repayments will begin. In other words, whatever Uncle Sam has been out annually, say between two hundred or three hundred thousand dollars each year, has been charged against the final account of the Imperial irrigation district. If this is the true situation, and I believe it is, how long is that sort of thing to continue?

Now if this part of the story as I have given it thus far is correct—and I think it is—this does not set well with you nor with me. What may be said to explain this situation? Now, I have had several witnesses in hearings before my committee who have pointed out that the Imperial irrigation district has a contract dating from 1932, in which they agree to pay construction costs on condition and when the works are completed and turned over to the district for control. Although the works are really completed and have been for a long time, they have not been turned over to the control of the Imperial irrigation district. Therefore, under the strict terms of that contract, no payments are technically and legally due to the Government from the Imperial irrigation district.

That is a contract which I have said no Secretary of the Interior should ever have signed, but you will recall the words of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] to the effect that the Imperial irrigation district has been anxious to begin their contract repayments. He means, of course, that they are anxious to have the control of the Imperial Dam and all parts of the All-American Canal turned over to them, and they are appealing to you today and have been appealing for a long time not to appropriate money for the Bureau of Recla-

mation to operate these facilities but instead, under the terms of their contract, to turn the works over to their control. I vigorously protest that proposal.

I know a contract is a sacred and binding thing. I do want Uncle Sam to make it his practice to keep his word and fulfill his agreement, but also I want to remind you that there have been numerous times in American history when, for the general good of the Nation, the Government had to break a contract or to change it. After the All-American contract was entered into in 1932, this Government made a treaty with Mexico to furnish Mexico 1,500,000 acre-feet annually, of which 500,000 acre-feet of water was to be delivered to Mexico through that first section of the All-American Canal. The Californians were very anxious to have a larger amount of water go to Mexico through the All-American Canal. For reasons of their own, they fought the ratification of that treaty bitterly, but the treaty was ratified by the Senate on April 18, 1946, by a vote of 76 yeas, 10 nays, and 10 not voting. From that vote, evidently the United States Senate regarded that treaty with Mexico as very important and eminently fair. Most of us in the West, especially in the Colorado River Basin, regarded the best kind of treaty we could obtain with Mexico as a vital necessity for the protection of the water rights in all the States of the Colorado River Basin.

Naturally, we do not want that treaty to be breeched or abrogated, and naturally we want no one other than the constituted authority of the United States Government to have charge of carrying out the provisions of the treaty. The paramount national interest requires the treaty to be faithfully observed and carried out. I can never view with equanimity the suggestion that the carrying out of the treaty be left in the control of the Imperial irrigation district, as its officials have proposed and insisted upon.

The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], remarked that any change in the law should be handled by the committee of which I am chairman, and seemed to think I was bypassing my own committee. I do recognize that it is an injustice for the United States Government to hold the Imperial irrigation district strictly and completely for the full repayment of this cost on an expensive canal, now that the Government—in carrying out an international obligation—has commandeered a large portion of its capacity. Indeed, justice to the farmers of the Imperial irrigation district would seem to indicate that there should be a renegotiation of contract and a writing-off of part of the expense by the Government, but accompanied by a steadfast insistence on the part of the United States Government to keep the control of the Imperial diversion dam and the first section of the All-American Canal under control of the United States Government. Meanwhile, this rich and prosperous irrigation district ought to pay its operation

and maintenance charges as the law requires of all other districts and certainly the repayments of construction costs have been delayed long enough and ought to be immediately begun.

The Clerk read as follows:

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FACILITIES, FORT PECK PROJECT, MONTANA

The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to transfer to the Department of the Interior without exchange of funds, all of the right, title, and interest of the Department of the Army in and to the following facilities, including rights-of-way (except that portion of the rights-of-way within the Fort Peck Reservoir area), but there shall be reserved the right to use the power facilities for the purpose of transmitting power to the Fort Peck project during emergency periods when the Fort Peck power plant is not functioning: (a) the Fort Peck-Rainbow (Great Falls) 161-kilovolt transmission line; (b) the Rainbow (Great Falls) terminal facilities; and (c) the Fort Peck-Whitley 50-kilovolt transmission line and substation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 18, lines 7 to 21, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The language is as follows:

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FACILITIES, FORT PECK PROJECT, MONTANA

The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to transfer to the Department of the Interior without exchange of funds, all of the right, title, and interest of the Department of the Army in and to the following facilities, including rights-of-way (except that portion of the rights-of-way within the Fort Peck Reservoir area), but there shall be reserved the right to use the power facilities for the purpose of transmitting power to the Fort Peck project during emergency periods when the Fort Peck power plant is not functioning: (a) the Fort Peck-Rainbow (Great Falls) 161-kilovolt transmission line; (b) the Rainbow (Great Falls) terminal facilities; and (c) the Fort Peck-Whitley 50-kilovolt-transmission line and substation.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I submit that the point of order made by the gentleman from New York comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is timely. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

(Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at that point after the vote on the Phillips amendment.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for purchase of not to exceed 100 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed \$60,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including such services at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per day, when authorized by the Secretary; payment of claims for damage

to or loss of property, personal injury or death arising out of activities of the Bureau of Reclamation; payment, except as otherwise provided for, of compensation and expense of persons on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as authorized by law to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts without reimbursement or return under the reclamation laws; rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of law involving property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; performance of the functions specified under the head "Operation and Maintenance Administration," Bureau of Reclamation, in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1945; preparation and dissemination of useful information including recordings, photographs, and photographic prints; and studies of recreational uses of reservoir areas, as authorized by law: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant to the act of April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377), for expenses other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects except \$5,500,000 under the head "General administrative expenses" and \$1,000,000 for reconnaissance, basin surveys, and general engineering and research under the head "General investigations."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas:

Page 19, line 15, strike out "\$60,000" and insert "\$30,000."

In line 17, strike out "\$100" and insert "\$50."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment applies to the reclamation section of the bill where \$60,000 is appropriated for individuals who may be employed for as much as \$100 per day and for as many days as this agency may see fit to employ such individuals for as long as the money lasts.

My amendment strikes out the \$60,000 and inserts \$30,000. It strikes out \$100 per day and inserts \$50 per day. Under the general statute authorizing the appropriation, an agency may, if the appropriation bill so provides, pay persons at a per diem rate of the highest salary under civil service, which is \$43 or \$44 per day. Under my amendment it is an even \$50 per day. The act does say that if specifically authorized in the appropriation bill, it may be \$100 per day.

I call particular attention to the fact that no qualifications of the individuals are indicated in the bill or in the law. The agency may hire whom they please and for as long as they choose. It seems to me \$50 per day, or as much as \$600 per week, together with expenses, is a pretty good-sized sum to pay individuals without qualifications or regulations.

It will be claimed, I assume, that these persons are experts in their field, but nothing in the bill indicates such qualifications. In civil service, employment qualifications are required before the people may be employed in any jobs. This is especially true in the higher-bracket positions. So it is possible employees who are especially qualified under civil service will be working with people who may or may not be qualified for the jobs.

Mr. Chairman, this is a case of "a camel getting its nose under the tent,"

and in a good many places at that. It seems that only recently these agencies have got on to the idea of adding a few hundred thousand dollars to take care of so-called individuals who can work part time at a rate of \$2,500 a month and expenses, if the chief of the agency sees fit to provide such employment. The amendment should be adopted. You will not only save at least \$30,000, but the principle involved in even more important.

After all, this could be just another way of putting individuals on the payroll without qualification requirements.

If a person is employed for 6 days a week at \$100 a day, that is just \$600 a week.

Let us cut this item and save \$30,000. I realize this seems a small amount compared with the manner in which expenditures are being made these days, but surely the saving of \$30,000 without injury to anyone is worth while. I hope the Committee will see fit to sustain me in this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

(Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we debated this question adequately last week. I call the attention of Members to this matter: Last week we spent 47 minutes on an item just like this. As near as I can figure it, it costs about \$27,000 to run the Congress for an hour. So we debated it last week for 47 minutes, and it cost almost \$25,000 to debate this question. There was only about \$14,000 involved. So we certainly made a saving, whether the engineer is worth what we are offering to pay him or not.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman, as chairman of this great committee—

Mr. KIRWAN. I would not say "great."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Well, I do, and the gentleman is a great Member of this House, and I mean exactly what I say. But he certainly does not measure this legislation which we pass in Congress on the basis of the time that is taken on various amendments?

Mr. KIRWAN. No; I am talking about economy.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We can get through now in 7 minutes.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; we debated this 47 minutes last week, and after that 47 minutes it did not pass. If it had passed we would have saved \$20,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It lacked only two votes.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; but it did not pass. But if it had passed, whether the

engineers were worth \$100 a day or not, we would have saved \$20,000 on it, but it cost us \$27,000 of debate. That is great economy.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I call attention to the fact that there is also a principle involved here along with the question of saving dollars.

Mr. KIRWAN. I understand. The principle was economy.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Economy, but still there was a principle involved.

Mr. KIRWAN. It costs us more to debate the principle than we could economize had the amendment carried.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Now you can save \$30,000 in 7 minutes.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; we should try to save. When an engineer has highly specialized knowledge, if he is not worth \$100 a day, he is not worth hiring. I feel just as does the gentleman from Kansas that they should not be hired when they are not needed. But if he is a worthy man and he has some specialized knowledge that the regular employees of the Bureau of Reclamation do not have, then we have to pay what such men are worth. If they can get hold of some man that has particular knowledge that the 1,200 engineers in the Reclamation Service have not, then he is certainly worth \$100 a day.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does not the gentleman think, following the gentleman's line of reasoning, that the legislation should at least qualify these individuals and say what they are supposed to be qualified to do under some requirement such as they have in civil service? People are employed under civil service for much less salary, engineers, or whatever they may be, but at least we know they have some qualification, and we should require some qualification in the case of these experts.

Mr. KIRWAN. If you could qualify them, if the Department could get them from civil service, they would not be hiring engineers at \$100 a day.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that the time that is wasted on these amendments just makes the Members work a little harder and come a little nearer to earning their money?

Mr. KIRWAN. I would not say that.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. It would appear from the position advanced by the gentleman from Kansas that he would rather have two at \$50 a day than one at \$100 a day.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I was hoping that this administration would hire people who are worth \$50 a day and get qualified men, and I think they could if they tried. That applies to a good many places in Government just as well as it does in this agency.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JACKSON of Washington) there were—ayes 53, noes 50.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Allotments to the Missouri River Basin project from the appropriation under the head "Construction and rehabilitation" shall be available additionally for said project for those functions of the Bureau of Reclamation provided for under the head "General investigations" (but this authorization shall not preclude use of the appropriation under said head within that area), and for the continuation of investigations by agencies of the Department on a general plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin. Such allotments may be expended through or in cooperation with State and other Federal agencies, and advances to such agencies are hereby authorized.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska: Page 21, line 3, after the period, insert "That the reservoir behind Medicine Creek Dam in Frontier County of the State of Nebraska, heretofore known, designated, and referred to as 'Medicine Creek Reservoir,' shall hereafter be designated and referred to as 'Harry Strunk Lake.' Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such reservoir is designated or referred to under and by the name of 'Medicine Creek Reservoir' shall be held and considered to refer to such reservoir under and by the name of 'Harry Strunk Lake.'"

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for the Geological Survey to perform surveys, investigations, and research covering topography, geology, and the mineral and water resources of the United States, its Territories and possessions; classify lands as to mineral character and water and power resources; give engineering supervision to power permits and Federal Power Commission licenses; enforce departmental regulations applicable to oil, gas, and other mining leases, permits, licenses, and operating contracts; and publish and disseminate data relative to the foregoing activities; \$22,900,000, of which \$3,300,000 shall be available only for cooperation with States or municipalities for water-resources investigations; *Provided*, That the share of the Geological Survey in any topographic mapping or water-resources investigations carried on in cooperation with any State or municipality shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost thereof.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: Page 23, line 12, strike out "\$22,900,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$21,900,000."

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to reduce

the appropriation for the Geological Survey by \$1,000,000.

The sum carried in the bill is \$22,900,000. This is an increase of \$4,318,000 over the 1951 appropriation, and the 1951 appropriation was \$3,000,000 more than the 1950 figure. At this time when the military program calls for vastly increased spending for defense purposes, all spending by civilian agencies ought to be reduced, if possible.

If they cannot be reduced, then every effort should be made to hold them at current levels and not increase them. Yet this item in the appropriation bill is not reduced. It is not even held at last year's level. It is increased \$4,318,000, which is an increase of approximately 24 percent, or one-fourth over last year's appropriation.

Not only does the bill carry an increase of 24 percent over last year, but last year's appropriation carried an increase over the preceding year of \$3,000,000, or nearly 20 percent. In the 1950 fiscal year the appropriation for this agency was \$15,887,012. It was increased in the 1951 fiscal year to \$18,882,000.

In this time when spending should be reduced, it is not being reduced at all in this agency. On the contrary it is increasing year by year, and the increase is growing both in amount and percentage. The figures which I have just given you are shown on pages 828 and 829 of part 2 of the hearings. The bill before us proposes to raise it again, this time to \$22,900,000.

The work of this agency is divided into seven categories; six of them carry large increases over last year. Only one of the seven is held at last year's figure, and last year all seven of them carried large increases over the year before.

The only category which is not increased in this bill this year is the smallest item of the seven categories, namely, \$41,000 for soil and moisture conservation. Topographic surveys and mapping carries an increase of \$1,430,000, being increased from seven and a half million to \$8,930,000. Geology and mineral resource surveys and mapping carries an increase of \$1,710,000. Four other categories, water-resources investigation, classification of lands, supervision of mining and oil and gas leases, and general administration, all carry large increases this year over last year, and every one of them carried substantial increases last year over the year before.

I realize, of course, that the effort to justify this increase, is the claim that it is based on the needs of national defense. It is contended that Alaska needs to be mapped for defense purposes, and that other mapping is necessary for defense purposes, and \$1,430,000 increase is provided for that item.

This cut of \$1,000,000 can be effected without disturbing the mapping program, if that program is of so much importance that it needs to be carried out in its entirety. There are five other categories carrying increases in this bill, and this reduction of \$1,000,000 can be distributed among them if necessary. Frankly, I think it can be distributed

over the six categories. The \$1,000,000 can be cut off and still leave an increase of \$3,318,000 over last year. The \$1,000,000 reduction can be made and still leave \$6,000,000 over year before last.

I do not think another annual increase for the water-resources investigations is justified. There are many agencies, Federal, State, as well as private, constantly doing work of this nature. Work of a related nature is done by the Army engineers, by various State agencies, by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and a survey of "Water in Industry" was completed in December 1950 by the National Association of Manufacturers, working jointly with the Conservation Foundation. Also related activity is being carried on by the Soil Conservation Agency, the Bureau of Reclamation, and other groups.

Certainly it will be no death blow to the water-resources investigations carried on by that department if its appropriation this year should be held to the same level as last year, because last year's appropriation was \$1,344,000 more than the 1950 appropriation, and the amount carried in this bill is a \$737,000 increase over last year. If this one item alone should be held at last year's figure, that would very nearly take care of the million-dollar reduction proposed in this amendment.

The Department of the Interior is not a department which has a background of retrenchment or of undertaking to operate on an economical basis. The Department of the Interior was investigated during the last Congress by the Williams subcommittee. The Williams subcommittee had this to say with reference to the method of operation and the constantly increasing expenses of that department:

The Department reports that for the past 5 years it has made a concerted effort to decentralize its operations to the field. In this there has been an attempt to draw a distinction between line operations to be carried on in the field and staff work to be retained in the Washington headquarters. In this decentralization the total employment in the field has increased from 34,752 in January 1944 to 50,769 on the same date in 1949. This represents an increase of 46 percent. During the same period the Washington headquarters staff decreased from 4,490 to 3,614 employees—a reduction of only 20 percent. Even this disproportionate decrease is substantially nullified when we take into account the 2,224 additional employees carrying on a part of the headquarters functions in Denver, Colo.

So that while it would appear that there actually was a decrease in the personnel doing headquarters work, as a matter of fact when the 2,224 engaged in that occupation in Denver are added to the number here in Washington, it shows a total of 5,238, which actually is an increase and not a decrease at all. So the amendment which I offer would cut \$1,000,000 from the \$4,000,000—plus increase which is provided in this bill for the second consecutive year, and would still leave an increase of over \$3,000,000 over the sum that was appropriated last year. It will certainly be no death blow to any of these functions if this amend-

ment is adopted, and I ask that it be adopted.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there was not a member of the committee that did not agree that this part of the bill was necessary and essential. I heard the gentleman from Georgia say that it was more than it was last year. I wonder if the military got more money this year than they had last year. Certainly the estimate for the Geological Survey is more, and they have already transferred \$10,000,000 from the defense agency over to this Bureau. That is how essential and necessary it is. It is needed to cooperate with the \$66,000,000,000 we are going to spend on national defense. The Army and Navy are forever asking this Bureau for maps and charts, and other groups are hunting for minerals that are essential. What if the increase was for six, eight, or ten million? They got \$10,000,000 transferred from the defense agency to this Bureau, and before they are finished they are going to have about \$15,000,000 transferred. Why do they want to take \$4,000,000 or \$3,000,000 or even \$1,000,000 out of this appropriation? That is why I am asking you to pay attention to this part of the program.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Did the gentleman listen to the reading of the amendment?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It was not to take out \$4,000,000 or \$3,000,000, it was to take out \$1,000,000.

Mr. KIRWAN. To take out \$1,000,000, but I am telling the gentleman they have transferred \$10,000,000 to this agency. That is how badly this agency is needed.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The gentleman was talking as though the author of the amendment had not considered what figures were in the bill. The gentleman is farther off on the amendment than I am on the bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. It does not make much difference whether you ask for a four, three, two, or one million cut.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to agree with my chairman. Dr. Wrather, Director of the Geological Survey, is in my opinion the most able and most honest administrator we have in Government today.

Dr. Wrather has been very economical-minded in his request for funds. They have a great job to do in Alaska, and the geological service has a great job to do in all the fields in that department. We are in favor of rewarding a man like that and giving him what he needs to do a job in these critical times. I have voted for every amendment which was offered here today to cut this bill since the bill has been on the floor, but I cannot vote to cut this agency which I think is very important to the defense of our Nation, and because I know that Dr.

Wrather is a great American and would not ask for any more than he needs.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I do not think there is a man in the House who would equip a soldier—whether it is one or two or three million men that we will have in the Army when we get through with it—with guns, then refuse to give him bullets. That is what you are doing here. You are refusing to give ammunition to the Government of the United States and the men who are working in national defense activities by trying to cut this appropriation.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman from Georgia, as I know from observing him, is very conscientious. However, I cannot help but call his attention to the fact that the committee I am serving on has had some little difficulty in holding down appropriations because of the survey which was made to increase the district attorneys tremendously in the District of Columbia. I realize that that is somewhat foreign to this subject, but I merely wanted to throw that in because he has made a study of that and a very thorough study and he realizes of course the importance of increasing the number of personnel there. At the same time he has not had the opportunity to go into this as fully as this committee has. This committee, headed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], is a very conscientious and sincere committee. I am sure if they could see where they could make reductions without impairing the defense of this country they would have curtailed the expenditure on this particular item.

Therefore, I think it would be very wise for the House to go along with the splendid work that this committee has done as a matter of national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia) there were—ayes 47, noes 53.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DAVIS of Georgia and Mr. JACKSON of Washington.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 66, noes 64.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The amount appropriated for the Geological Survey shall be available for purchase of not to exceed 117 passenger motor vehicles, of which 80 shall be for replacement only; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service for protection of confidential files; contracting for the furnishing of topographic maps and for the making of geophysical or other specialized surveys when it is administratively determined that such procedures are in the public interest; construction and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands for gaging stations; and payment of compensation and expenses (not to exceed \$10,000) of the

person appointed by the President to participate as the representative of the United States in the administration of the compact consented to by the act of May 31, 1949 (Public Law 82): *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President is authorized to appoint a retired officer as such representative, without prejudice to his status as a retired Army officer, and he shall receive such compensation and expenses in addition to his retired pay.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON of Washington: On page 23, lines 22 and 23, strike out "of which 80 shall be."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this is simply a perfecting amendment to carry out an amendment previously agreed to, limiting the number of motor vehicles that can be purchased.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. Permit the Chair to state that during the consideration of the bill last week the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] offered four amendments which were considered en bloc, by unanimous consent. One of the amendments had reference to the language in lines 21 and 22 on page 23.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has offered an amendment to make the language conform to the action of the committee in adopting the so-called Williams amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, may I explain to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that last week the House agreed to an amendment which would limit all automobile purchases to replacements only. This amendment is simply a perfecting amendment to make the language throughout the bill conform to the amendment adopted by the House last week.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and improvement of facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Mines, to remain available until expended, \$1,250,000: *Provided*, That the unused balance of the contract authorization of \$15,000,000 granted in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1946, under the head "Synthetic liquid fuels," is hereby rescinded.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language contained in line 19, page 24, beginning with the word "*Provided*," and continuing through lines 19, 20, 21, and 22, inclusive, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAGGERS: Page 25, line 19, after the word "expended", strike

out "\$1,250,000" and insert "\$3,850,000 of which \$2,600,000 is be used for the construction and equipment of an experimental station in or near Morgantown, W. Va., as authorized by act of Congress, Public Law 812, Eighty-first Congress."

[Mr. STAGGERS addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, may I make the announcement that the next order of business after disposition of the pending bill will be the wheat-for-India bill.

VERMONT AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

Mr. PRIEST (at the request of Mr. COOLEY) submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 271) to authorize transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 401)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vermont, for agricultural purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to transfer and convey to the Vermont Agricultural College, a State-owned corporation, upon acceptance by said agricultural college, without cost, the real property comprising nine hundred forty-two and forty-two one-hundredths acres, more or less, of the United States Morgan Horse Farm located in Addison County, town of Weybridge, Vermont, and such of the personal property of this station as may be agreed upon, in writing, by the Secretary of Agriculture and the dean of the Vermont Agricultural College. Such real and personal property and research records shall be transferred upon the express condition that they shall be used by the Vermont Agricultural College for the benefit of agriculture

for such period as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the said college at the time of transfer.

"The authority herein contained shall expire on June 30, 1951, unless, prior to such expiration date, the dean of the Vermont Agricultural College shall have notified the Secretary of Agriculture of the acceptance of the lands and other property of the station under the terms of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GEORGE GRANT,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CLYDE R. HOEY,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 271) relating to the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The House amendment struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and inserted an amendment in lieu thereof. The committee of conference has agreed to recommend that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment.

The provisions of the conference substitute are the same as the provisions adopted by the House, except as explained below:

The measure as it passed the House would have required the deed of conveyance to contain a provision reserving any minerals that might be found to exist, including the right to enter, remove, and extract same, and a provision which would cause the title to the lands to revert to the United States if the property was put to any use other than for the benefit of agriculture.

These provisions have been eliminated in the conference substitute. The conference substitute, however, provides that the real and personal property and research records are to be transferred upon the express condition that they shall be used by the Vermont Agricultural College for the benefit of agriculture, for such period as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the said college at the time of the transfer. This language will give the Secretary of Agriculture somewhat broader authority and will provide greater flexibility in the negotiations that must be conducted between the Secretary of Agriculture and officials of the Vermont Agricultural College in connection with the transfer of the properties. It is the belief of the committee that the language of the conference substitute is ample to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the intent of the Congress and to protect fully the interests of the United States.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GEORGE GRANT,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REECE, of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I introduced a resolution to establish a National Com-

mission on Security and Peace. I ask unanimous consent that this may be printed in the Record at this point together with a supporting statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND PEACE, INTRODUCED BY REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL REECE

Resolved, That Congress hereby creates and establishes a National Commission on Security and Peace, to examine the soundness, direction, and effectiveness of the foreign policy of the United States, and the military strategy now being employed in support thereof.

The National Commission on Security and Peace shall be charged with recommending to Congress and the President a sound foreign policy, together with an integrated military policy to support it, within the limits of American resources.

The Commission shall be composed of 6 Senators appointed by the Vice President; 6 Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker; and 6 members appointed by the President of the United States, representing the Nation at large. The 12 Members appointed from the Congress shall be divided equally between the two major parties; the six members appointed by the President shall include the ex-President of the United States; and such generals of the Army; admirals of the fleet, and the Air Force generals, who are not now performing active service.

Appropriations not exceeding \$100,000 are hereby authorized for the necessary expenses of the Commission.

All executive papers, files, and documents pertinent to the Commission's inquiry shall be made available by the several departments and agencies of the Federal establishment upon request of the Chairman.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we have suffered more than 60,000 American casualties in Korea. The purpose of my resolution is to find out where we are headed, both in foreign policy and military program.

The American people demand a definition of foreign policy in terms they can understand. They likewise demand a restatement of our national military policy consonant with the ideals and traditions of constitutional government.

Impeachment of administrative officers would serve no constructive national purpose until the people have before them a clear and understandable statement of both foreign and military policies.

This Nation has contributed more than \$30,000,000,000 since the end of World War II in grants, gifts, and loans overseas. This, we were told repeatedly, was the price of peace. American taxpayers gladly paid that price, but peace did not come. Instead, we now face a military budget approaching \$60,000,000,000 a year, plus an additional \$10,000,000,000 for overseas grants, gifts, and loans.

Our present policy has failed to deter war, it has failed to stop the spread of communism, and the struggle may continue indefinitely, exhausting our economy.

A truly bipartisan foreign policy may be achieved only by honest debate. We have never had such a foreign policy

since the end of the World War II, in 1945. Secret diplomacy can never command the patriotic support of the American people. Appeasement of godless communism never will be tolerated by the American citizens.

The publicly stated purpose of American foreign policy since 1945 has been to contain Communist aggression. Since that time the Communist dominion has expanded from 200,000,000 to 800,000,000 population. The people ask openly, "Has American foreign policy been betrayed in high places?"

America's effort was the decisive factor in winning a complete and overwhelming victory for free government in World War II. In that war America furnished 14,000,000 men and \$400,000,000,000 in material and supplies.

When victory was achieved, this Nation occupied a position of strength and world leadership. We were looked to for support, guidance, and inspiration by all of our allies, and there was no nation in a position at that time to challenge the peace, to endanger our security, or to threaten the cause of free government at any time in the foreseeable future. In six short years that position of strength and leadership has been lost. During those 6 years, America has followed a foreign policy whereby Soviet Russia and its Communist satellites have risen to a position of unaccustomed power and strength. That power today despises and seeks to humiliate free government the world around.

The American appeasement and surrender began under Alger Hiss at Yalta, and was reaffirmed at Potsdam. Under this policy, by appeasement or otherwise, we made the following concessions, at Potsdam and elsewhere, without which it would have been impossible for Russia and her satellites to have risen to a position in which she could with impunity ignore and defy the whole morality of international law and freedom:

First. Made agreements, or acquiesced in agreements, which gave to Russia or enabled her to dominate the Baltic states of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Danzig, Prussia, and all-weather, year-around, seaport of Konigsberg; the central territory of East Germany with its uranium mines and precision-instruments works, Berlin, and Poland; the Balkan states of Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Albania, and Hungary.

Second. Adoption of Morgenthau plan for reducing Germany to a pastoral state and destroying its industrial capacity and abolishing the whole civil government of Germany.

Third. Agreed for Russia to remove from Germany and Austria for its own use several billions of dollars worth of key industrial plant facilities and machinery together with the scientists, engineers, and technical information for building up war industry. At the same time, we, ourselves, during the past decade, furnished Russia and its satellites, direct and indirect, commercial and governmental, more than \$16,000,000,000 more in raw materials supplies and equipment without which her war potential would have been delayed many years.

Fourth. Gave Russia 10 snorkel submarines and the snorkel plant at Hamburg as well as the whole snorkel "assembly" line along the Oder and Elbe Rivers together with parts that lay in the satellite plants from which, it is estimated, a fleet of 300 submarines was built which now constitutes Russia's most threatening war arm.

Fifth. After Japan had submitted an offer to surrender on substantially the same terms which were later accepted, negotiated with Russia to enter the war against Japan which then gave it an excuse to sit in on the peace conference as an equal partner without having contributed anything toward victory in the Pacific.

Sixth. In violation of previous commitments, gave all of Manchuria, the industrial part of China, to Russia.

Seventh. In addition, gave Russia, in the East, Outer Mongolia, Sakhalin Islands, Port Arthur, the Kuriles, and Northern Korea which contains most of Korea's water power and industry.

Eighth. Sent to China a mission to negotiate with the Nationalists to force the Communists into the Nationalist Government and, when the Nationalists declined to do so, ceased sending them the support which Congress had authorized, and thus undermined the Nationalist Government, preparing the way for the Communists with Russian support, to take over all China.

Ninth. Failed to arm South Korea or to send it the support authorized by Congress.

Tenth. When Ambassador Hurley sent back from China 11 members of his staff for sympathizing with the Communists, they were assigned positions of greater importance in the State Department, one of them being made head of the Far East Division, and another the assistant for that division.

Eleventh. As the conviction of Alger Hiss, William Remington, Marzana, and the various atomic spies, as well as other Communists, indicates, Communists and their fellow travelers were permitted to insinuate themselves into positions of trust and influence in the State Department, the atomic energy project, and other departments which had a close relationship to defense and foreign affairs.

Today, there is widespread uncertainty about our foreign policy, or lack of confidence that we have a definite foreign policy and an integrated defense program which will enable us to resist the Communist threat and gain a true and lasting peace.

The present continuous state of emergency and threat of war, without a program to bring our effort to a successful conclusion, is exhausting our economy, which after all, is the one last bulwark not only for our own liberty and security but the cause of free government everywhere. It is essential to the security of our country and the peace of the world that Congress have the full facts of our foreign and military policy, that it may give the American people a program which will be within the limits of our economy, within the terms of the Constitution, and harmonious with our

American ideals of peace and freedom under law.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

GENERAL MACARTHUR'S INTELLIGENCE SERVICE

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I was appalled by General MacArthur's brazen disregard for the truth when, in his Chicago speech on April 26, he blamed the slaughter of American boys in Korea on a national policy he called unrealistic.

The truth is that the gross incompetence and inefficiency of General MacArthur's intelligence, headed by Maj. Gen. Charles Willoughby, was directly responsible for the frightful and needless slaughter and horrible death by freezing of thousands of American soldiers in Korea last December. In those 2 weeks in December our casualties were perhaps greater than the total of the previous 5 months of the war in Korea.

I do not know of a single instance in modern military history where a main striking force was ordered to advance in such a spread-out fashion in enemy territory by a command which was so unbelievably ignorant of enemy disposition, striking power, and intentions as was the case last December. The American soldiers were ordered into what amounted literally to a valley of death for thousands of them. Only the courage and superior mechanization of our troops enabled them to avoid a complete annihilation and to fight their way out of the trap. In any case, it was one of the most disastrous military set-backs received by our forces in American history.

The shocking incompetence of MacArthur's intelligence staff first came to light last June when he had no more idea of the North Korean military potential or intentions than we did at home, 6,000 miles away. Later, in the "home for Christmas" offensive, both French and British intelligence warned, on the basis of their information, that the Chinese might strike if our troops approached the Yalu River reservoirs, but MacArthur ignored these warnings.

I have had enough experience with guerrillas behind enemy lines in northern Yugoslavia during World War II to have some idea of what can or cannot be done in this type of campaign. I know that it is possible to infiltrate agents into enemy territory and obtain a reasonable knowledge of enemy build-ups and to calculate the possibility and nature of a sudden offensive.

It is a fact that North Korean agents, and later whole combat guerrilla units, constantly infiltrated into South Korea and kept their command informed of all developments. I know that it would likewise have been possible to send South Korean agents into North Korea to obtain needed information upon which to base our military decisions.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82^d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 97

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 2, 1951

No. 79

House of Representatives

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, as we continue to go forth in the hours of this new day, grant that we may meet all our various experiences and opportunities for service with a pure and steadfast devotion.

We pray that Thou wilt take our confused and groping minds and transform them into centers of light and power as we seek to solve the difficult problems of struggling humanity.

Show us how we may help to cultivate and bring to fruition those finer moral and spiritual aspirations and values which Thou hast planted within the soul of man.

May discouragement, doubt, and defeatism be supplanted by the indomitable and adventurous spirit of courage and hope.

Inspire us with a sincere desire to incarnate and manifest the ideals and principles of the Prince of Peace in whose life we find the clear and commanding revelation of our duty toward Thee and our fellow men.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3096. An act relating to the acquisition and disposition of land and interests in land by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Federal Civil Defense Administration.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 217) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That JOHN C. WATTS, of Kentucky, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Public Works.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING DISPLACED PERSONS ACT OF 1948

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3576) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is the so-called displaced-persons bill?

Mr. WALTER. This is the extension of the first phase of the activity from July 31 to December 31. The entire act does not expire until December 1952. However, this is necessary because of the decisions of the Attorney General holding up the movement of certain of these people who come within the purview of the statute.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is a continuance for 6 months; is that correct?

Mr. WALTER. That is right. It is the unanimous report of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the reports I get about the displaced persons they are sending into my section of the country are discouraging, indeed. If that is the kind they are going to bring here, I submit we had better stop it now. I am going to object to the unanimous-consent request to take this bill up at this time. I think it ought to come in under a rule and be thoroughly discussed.

Mr. WALTER. There is a rule.

Mr. RANKIN. The folks we are displacing are the American farmers, with this DiSalle crazy order. Let us look after the American people a while. I object, Mr. Speaker.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 25 minutes today, following the legislative

program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today and for 20 minutes on Wednesday, May 9, following the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

ROLL-BACK IN BEEF PRICES MAY RESULT IN MEAT FAMINE

(Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the announced roll-back in beef prices may well result in a meat famine for the American people. The roll-back order of the Office of Price Stabilization is already resulting in a strong movement of unfinished feeder cattle to market. The situation at Sioux City, Iowa, which is one of the largest stock markets in the country, is already reaching alarming proportions. Animals are coming in 200 or 300 pounds light of what they would weigh if they were finished and, in some cases, buyers are compelled to refuse any more deliveries until the situation eases somewhat. Due to unseasonable wet weather, feed lots and country roads are in bad condition and when this situation improves there is likely to be a still stronger flow of cattle to the stock yards. Furthermore, feeders who paid high prices for cattle up to as high as 40 cents a pound shortly before the roll-back announcement stand to suffer a considerable loss.

If this unseasonable marketing of cattle continues, it naturally follows that before long the American people will be short the number of pounds of meat which the animal would have gained had it been fattened and brought to the best condition for market. It should

also be said that from now on there are likely to be fewer cattle in the feed lots and the consumer will have to pay higher prices, and there is bound to be a return to the black market. In fact, reports reaching me from northwest Iowa indicate that the black market is already in operation.

It looks like we are headed for the disastrous days of OPA all over again. If the present policy of the OPS is carried out, the meat consumer is going to be faced with less meat within 90 days and rationing may have to follow. Those of us from the meat-producing sections of the country are insisting that the impractical experts in Washington dealing with this problem give way to men of experience who know what they are talking about. It is highly essential that those in charge of the roll-back program immediately adopt a realistic approach to this critical situation before it is too late.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION ACT, 1952

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 38]

Belcher	Gillette	Morrison
Blatnik	Gore	Murray, Tenn.
Bramblett	Harden	Murray, Wis.
Breen	Hardy	Patman
Brehm	Harrison, Wyo.	Powell
Brooks	Hébert	Rains
Brownson	Hinshaw	Redden
Bush	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, N. Y.
Chatham	Hollifield	Rivers
Cole, N. Y.	Irving	Shelley
Corbett	Kee	Sittler
Coudert	Kelley, Pa.	Watts
Curtis, Mo.	Kennedy	Whitaker
Dawson	Kersten, Wis.	Whitten
Devereux	Klein	Widnall
Dingell	Mansfield	Wolcott
Donohue	Meador	Woodruff
Dorn	Miller, N. Y.	
Elliott	Morgan	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 373 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION ACT, 1952

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3790, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, there was pending the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAGGERS: Page 25, line 19, after the word "expended", strike out "\$1,250,000" and insert "\$3,850,000 of which \$2,600,000 is to be used for the construction and equipment of an experimental station in or near Morgantown, W. Va., as authorized by act of Congress, Public Law 812, Eighty-first Congress."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, these are times of decision, times of decision in your individual life, in the life of this Nation, and in the life of all mankind. The next year or year and a half will probably prove to be the most momentous in our time if not in the history of all civilization, as to whether we are prepared to meet the emergencies and contingencies that might arise.

Yesterday when the Committee rose, I told the House that we have 13 years of known oil supplies or reserves in the United States. These are the figures given to me by the Bureau of Mines. That is, at the present rate of consumption, and we are increasing that rate of consumption daily. We are spending billions and will spend more billions of dollars for machinery and other mechanized equipment to carry on the warfare, such as tanks, guns, and airplanes. History records that Hitler had one of the mightiest war machines of all times, but at the end of the war a great deal of his machinery was rusting because of lack of oil. He lost millions of men trying to get the oil supplies from the coast of the Black Sea. If we lose the oil supplies from the Near East and if the snorkle submarines of Russia cut off our supply of oil to the south or by sabotage, we are going to be in a precarious position in this Nation unless we have the foresight to be prepared for emergencies which might arise.

Whose responsibility is it to see that we are prepared and that we have the foresight to look into the future? If these conditions do arise and we are cut short, history will record that the responsibility rests right on the shoulders of the present Members of this Congress and no one else. Yesterday after presenting my amendment I talked to legal advisers of the different departments affected and to different Members of the Congress and came to the conclusion,

after reviewing the past laws, that my amendment was not necessary.

Going back over the law, the law of 1944 creating the synthetic liquid fuels program, the law of 1946 amending and extending it, in which contract authorizations were given to the Bureau of Mines and also the extension of the 1948 act, the present law, which was extended in 1950.

I quote briefly from that act:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act of April 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 190), as amended by the act of March 15, 1948 (62 Stat. 79), is further amended by changing the words "eight years" in the first sentence to read "eleven years."

Yesterday my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] struck from the pending bill the provision to turn back the contract obligations. These still rest with the Bureau of Mines, and they have the authority to carry on the work that they contemplate they need because we are in a state of emergency today and they have that authority to go ahead. So after talking to local advisers and different Members of Congress, as I said before, I have come to the conclusion that the present amendment would have no effect and is not necessary at the present time.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield.

Mr. GOLDEN. Can the gentleman give us some information as to the relative cost of producing this very essential liquid fuel from coal and shale as compared to ordinary methods of refining it from crude oil?

Mr. STAGGERS. I could not answer the distinguished gentleman's question, but I did hear the Director of the Bureau of Mines say that the present cost is higher under present methods. They are working on the development of methods for refining it at a lower cost.

Mr. GOLDEN. And is it not true that byproducts derived from coal make it a feasible process whereby we can go along with this program and that it should have sufficient appropriations to develop it?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is right.

Mr. GOLDEN. And is it not further true that many of these byproducts are essential in the defense program?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. Is it not true that other countries have far surpassed this country in the production of synthetic fuels?

Mr. STAGGERS. I believe that is true from the information that I have, that we are behind in our research work.

Mr. MARSHALL. And is it not true that committees of this Congress held long hearings and agreed that something ought to be done about it?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is true.

Mr. MARSHALL. And is it not also true that some of the people in the executive branch of the Government fail to carry out directives of the Congress? Congress authorizes them to proceed to do the things that should be done for the defense of this country that need doing for future development and conservation of resources. It is time that these directives by the Congress are carried out.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is exactly right, because the Congress authorized that this work be carried on, and this is the direct authorization of the intent of Congress.

As I said before, Mr. Chairman, I wish to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia to the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman from West Virginia finally decided to withdraw his amendment. He has a laudable ambition, of course, and should be complimented in attempting to serve the people of the coal area of West Virginia, but ultimately, if it becomes necessary, that service will be rendered, and I hope he may be in Congress long enough that he can take credit for having helped.

But after his remarks I should like to tell the House of Representatives that we heard this same story that we were running out of oil before World War II and during World War II, that we had only a few years' supply of oil, yet we helped supply our allies throughout the world with petroleum in winning the war and we had plenty of oil at the close of the war.

We have used since the winning of that war more oil in commercial enterprise and for carrying the industry of this country forward than ever before in peacetime, yet today the Nation's reserves of oil are the greatest in the history of our country; there are 30,000,000,000 barrels of oil in our reserves at the present time.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I cannot yield now.

In addition to that we have at our door to the south under our good-neighbor policy of trade with South American countries immense production of oil there that can be brought in, and we are bringing in from those countries something like a million barrels of oil a day.

In addition to that, on this continent in Canada there has been developed recently great oil fields. They are in the early stages of development, and now in the State of South Dakota there has been found the southern point they think of that great oil reserve in Canada, and are beginning to produce oil in North

Dakota. Oil fields will continue to be found throughout the Nation in the future as in the past.

All we need to do in this country is to see to it that the 27½-percent depletion allowance is left on the statute books and that this Congress continues to give the oil people the incentive to explore and bring in new fields. They will continue to go out and find new oil fields.

The chances are we will have enough oil to run this country for maybe a hundred more years. I have been in contact with people out in the great Northwest and in the Rocky Mountain area and am led to believe that we may yet develop oil fields out there that will rival those great oil fields of Texas.

So what we need to do is go ahead with what we have, to make certain we continue the 27½-percent oil and gas depletion, and continue our research and development service in reference to the conversion of coal.

A start has been made to convert oil shale rock and coal, as the gentleman from West Virginia so well pointed out. I congratulate him on raising this question, although I think it is immature. Seventy-six million dollars have been appropriated and fifty-seven million dollars have been spent for demonstration plants for conversion of rock shale and coal to oil and gas. I am told by the Bureau of Mines that there is a potentiality of 400,000,000,000 of oil reserves in the rock shales of Colorado and the other Rocky Mountain States which can be produced today in competition with oil.

Mr. Chairman, I am well aware of the fact they have demonstration coal plants in existence, for instance one in Louisiana, Mo., that is producing something like 200 barrels of gasoline a day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, a question was asked of the gentleman from West Virginia as to whether or not you can convert from real coal to oil on a competitive basis. You cannot do that today. It may take many years before it can be done. I should like to say that instead of the Government sticking its nose under the tent so far as this bill or any bill that follows is concerned for an appropriation of \$2,000,000 or \$3,000,000, to begin construction of new Government plants, that private enterprise stands ready today under the Defense Production Act if the Government will guarantee loans in connection with the building of these plants, to convert real coal to oil and oil derivatives which will lay the foundation also for the development of all sorts of plastics, chemicals, and so forth.

So private enterprise is ready and will take care of this matter when the need arises.

There is plenty of oil, there is plenty of coal, there is plenty of research and development up to the present time to

insure this Congress that it is not necessary to put the Government further into the development of coal conversion. Private enterprise can and will take over the job and do it better and more economically than can the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, may I make an observation. The committee on both sides has been about as tolerant with reference to time as any committee has ever been in the 11 years I have been in Congress. We are now in the fifth day of debate on this bill and at the moment we are debating a moot subject. The amendment has been withdrawn through the courtesy of our good friend from West Virginia. In all fairness we ought to get on with the business of the House. We have a lot of important legislation pending. I will appreciate the cooperation of Members on both sides in trying to consider the balance of the bill in an orderly, business-like way.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate, of course, to talk on such a slick subject as oil, but having served for many, many weeks as chairman of a subcommittee in the Eightieth Congress on this subject, I thought I might give a bit of information that may be valuable to all Members. The remarks of the gentleman from Washington, however, are well taken. I am just as eager as he is to continue with the real issues in this bill and to bring it to a vote as early as possible; therefore I shall say nothing further.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, there remains on the Clerk's desk three amendments of a perfecting nature to carry out the thought of an amendment adopted by the committee earlier in the consideration of this bill with reference to the purchase of automobiles. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the remaining amendments be considered en bloc at this time so that they can be disposed of without any unnecessary delay.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

Page 26, lines 8 and 9, strike out the comma and the words "of which 130 shall be."

Page 29, line 10, strike out the comma and the words "of which 19 shall be."

Page 31, line 22, strike out the comma and the words "of which 74 shall be."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and improvement, without regard to the act of August 24, 1912, as

amended (16 U. S. C. 451), of roads, trails, parkways, buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities; and the acquisition of lands, interests therein, improvements, and water rights; to remain available until expended, \$11,975,000, of which \$1,150,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under the head "Independence National Historical Park, Pennsylvania," in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950, and \$3,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in section 4 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, various facts were developed in our committee this morning in connection with power. We had before the committee the administrators of the Defense Electric Power Administration: Mr. Frank Brower, chief, Power Supply Division; Mr. J. E. Moore, consultant; Mr. Arthur Vieregge, regional engineer, Northwest and Pacific; Mr. H. L. Parlett, regional engineer, Colorado and Southwest; and Mr. Ralph Fackler, regional engineer, Dakotas and Nebraska.

The transcript of the hearing will be available tomorrow morning to any Member, I suppose, who wants to look at it. After these gentlemen had testified for approximately 1 hour, I submitted this question to them: I said, in effect as "I understand your presentation, you, under your jurisdiction, have mapped out plans which will give us the power we need for the defense effort until about 1953 based upon the best information you can get." I said, "That, of course, takes into consideration the plans you have made for constructing certain facilities and for meeting emergencies as best you can under the shortages of materials, and so on." They testified that there was one area not cared for, and that is the Northwest. I asked them why that was not cared for. The substance of the reply was that they needed about \$6,000,000 in appropriations. I asked them the status of the appropriations, and they said they did not know.

If you will refer to the language of the committee report on this bill on pages 11 and 12 you will find a few lines which carry quite a story which the Members of this subcommittee are quite familiar with. Now, this little thing that happened this morning has given me considerable light, and what I am going to say may call for some replies here.

I am going to submit the question to the members of the subcommittee, to the Members of the House and the Senate from the State of California and to the Members of the House and the Senate from the States of Oregon and Washington, and I ask: Why is there an absence of cooperation which permits an excess of power produced at the Shasta Dam to be transferred into Northwest territory, into the so-called Bonneville power area, to meet this emergency which has been testified to as existing by the Defense Electric Power Administration? Now that is a tough question, and I am going to let the gentleman from Washington, [Mr. JACKSON], a member of the committee, use his own time to answer that question. I understand there is a powerful rate war involved. I understand

there are objections on the part of certain men in the Northwest area who object to their power, or their water in the form of power, being transferred into the California area, or the California people, perhaps, objecting to their water in the form of power being transferred into the Northwest area. This committee report even goes so far as to call upon the Secretary of the Interior to hold meetings and investigate and find out about the insubordination of his junior officials who, it appears, the Committee on Appropriations claims are using funds contrary to the intent of Congress.

The second question I want to submit is this: Is it the intent of this Congress that excess power produced at the Shasta Dam shall not be used in the Northwest area to meet the present defense requirements of this country? If that is the intent of the Committee on Appropriations and this House, I think that is something the people in this country will be interested in. These men testified this morning that there was about \$6,000,000 involved here. If that is all that is involved, I could go to my friends and raise \$6,000,000 if I endorsed the proposition, and I mean that literally.

I hope that if the members of the subcommittee care to do so they will leave out all the "whifflepoof," put this thing right on the doorstep, and let the American people know whether or not the three of four States involved here are so interested in promoting their individual State welfare that they are willing to go contrary to the Defense Electric Power Administration and defeat the supply of power in the great Northwest needed for the defense effort.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of orderly procedure, I do not believe it is appropriate or proper that we go back and discuss this item, which was included under the Bureau of Reclamation appropriation. I do not believe time will permit a proper and thorough debate on the subject of this time.

May I suggest to my good friend from Michigan that he look into this matter a little more carefully before we start debating the subject.

To answer his first question, let me say that there is not a surplus of power at Shasta Dam for the Bonneville system. Any power that would flow from California to the northwest area would have to come from the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. steam plants in the San Francisco area. I think that if my good friend from Michigan will look into this matter he will find that it is a rather complicated subject and is not as simple as it might have appeared from his brief discussion this morning in his committee.

The committee report rather severely chastizes the Bureau of Reclamation for violating a directive given by the House at the last session of Congress. I am sure, knowing my good friend from Michigan, that he would not want to acquiesce in any action by any department of the Government which has violated the directives of the Committee on Appropriations in the expenditure of funds. Last year Congress

directed the Bureau of Reclamation not to spend any money on this intortie. As the gentleman will learn from the report, the Bureau of Reclamation violated that directive.

This issue is a far-reaching one, and I know my good friends in California and Oregon want a very careful consideration of the matter before we proceed any further. There is no doubt that there is a lot of engineering merit in this proposal, but it is not so simple that we can dispose of it here in 5 or 10 minutes. I therefore ask, in the interest of orderly procedure, that we continue with the reading of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the trouble is not that the shortage of power at the present time is in the Pacific Northwest, in the Tennessee Valley, and in Nebraska, where we have nothing, practically, but public power, and that the fact that private power has been frozen out has prevented the orderly development of power that we would get with private industry properly planning the situation. Is not that the trouble?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I will answer my good friend that that is not the trouble at all. As a matter of fact, if it had not been for the huge public power projects in the Pacific Northwest, the shortage now would be nothing short of catastrophic. In other words, to illustrate to my good friend from New York, the Portland General Electric Co. receives two-thirds of all the power it sells from the Bonneville Power Administration. The Puget Sound Power & Light Co., in the State of Washington, receives over a third of its power from the Bonneville Power Administration. It was not within the financial capacity of the private utilities of the Pacific Northwest to build such great projects as the Grand Coulee Dam, Bonneville Dam, and the other great structures now under way.

To supplement my statement, I should like to call to the attention of my good friend the fact that the private utilities are building a couple of dams at the present time of a smaller capacity than Bonneville and Grand Coulee. The problem is to develop the great power resources of that area just as fast as possible, so that both public and private bodies may receive the power that they so desperately need.

Mr. TABER. The fact remains that the shortage is in those three areas, and the other places where they have gone ahead with real development do not have it.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Sure, we have a shortage because our population has increased in the State of Washington by over 40 percent, and California and Oregon have likewise received very substantial increases in population.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, some time ago this bill was brought before the House. There has been a great deal of talk pro and con on it. As for me, I want to go along with JOHN TABER, and I will tell you why. When a man comes down here imbued with enthusiasm and attempting to reflect the will of the people, he has a few pet projects of his own. But he is soon sidetracked by some bureaucrat who attempts to sell him on some other project, and who tries to make him push forward a pet project of some department. I know of no better example than one right in my own district when a swivel-chair genius went up there some time ago and said, "You people are all wet. You don't want this floodwall project which is going to guarantee protection to the people of the greater Endicott-Vestal area."

"What you want," he said, "is an expensive system of dam building 50 miles up the Susquehanna and Chenango Rivers which will continue on down through another 30 years and by that time there will have been enough floods in our section to wash out the entire area and then nobody will need any flood control."

That is the situation, and I have had my fill of it. From now on when they come forward with dam-building projects for upstate New York, I am going to join forces with JOHN TABER in attempting to cut out all the appropriations fostering the brain children of these bureaucrats.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the very splendid statement he is making. I recall that several years ago he introduced legislation into this House to print a noninflationary dollar. I want to ask the gentleman if the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and our Republican friends who controlled the Eightieth Congress at that time had gotten behind the gentleman's measure and it had become law, would not we be out of all this inflationary trouble we are having today?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. How did they stand on it down in the gentleman's country?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I may say to the gentleman from New York that we are looking forward to it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In answer to that I would go along with what they wanted. If they wanted these things, I say give the people what they want. If they want flood walls let them have flood walls; but if they do not want dams, do not try to choke it down their throats.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the bill which was introduced was a bill which provided for a noninflationary dollar?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If the gentleman can conceive of one, it is all right with me. I do not recall that I ever introduced any such bill. I think

the gentleman is attempting to sidetrack the issue.

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; I am not attempting to sidetrack the issue at all. Anyone who is in favor of providing a noninflationary dollar is in favor of protecting the buying power of my savings.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot yield further, because this issue was injected in here to try to thwart the attempt, however, futile, that I am making of trying to save money. I am for economy. That is the reason I am going along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] on this amendment and on the bill. I want to save money for national defense. I say throw these projects into national defense if you want to save money. If you want to build walls, call them national defense in order to protect the war plants of any district. Let us practice economy and not attempt to becloud the issue here.

In a couple of weeks, I am speaking to a gigantic protest meeting in Chenango County, organized to resist the disastrous dam-building program, made by long-haired intellectuals as a counter proposal to the Hall flood wall plan, designed to protect the Triple Cities for all time.

Dam construction has been shown to be a long drawn out affair, too little and too late to assure the war plants and the homes of our workers of security from floods.

As I have said, this idea has been advanced solely as a diverting measure and poor substitute to the wishes of the people in the Valley of Fair Play.

The "experts" are actually afraid that this practical solution of our local flood problem might be reached and establish the fallacy of the dam building theory.

Actually the Binghamton flood walls stand as a guarantee that more flood walls for the residents and factories of Johnson City, Endicott, Oakdale, Westover, Hooper, Willow Point, Endwell, Union, and all other points in the adjacent areas, on the Susquehanna River are necessary and proper.

I might add that the citizens of Conklin and Kirkwood, just above Binghamton, also want local protection.

At the indignation meeting which is being sponsored by the enemies of dam building, I expect to emphasize my belief that Congress should put off for a hundred years any further construction of the dams in Chenango, Otsego, and Delaware Counties for the sake of the inhabitants of those counties. Adopt the Hall flood wall program, build the walls to protect defense industries of our section and accomplish what we all want to do, keep floods out of the area of our Triple Cities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Clerk will read.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Mississippi rise?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I made an improper reference in my statement; I mentioned the wrong name. It was C. G. Abbott, of the Smithsonian Institution.

The Clerk read as follows:

INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies and investigations respecting conservation, management, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources, including related aquatic plants and products; collection, compilation, and publication of information concerning such studies and investigations; and the performance of other functions related thereto; as authorized by law; \$4,046,000.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Page 30, line 14, strike out "\$4,046,000" and insert "\$3,875,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, we have been on this bill, as the chairman remarked, some 5 days. We have reduced this appropriation up to now by something like \$20,000,000. I do not believe we have hurt any agency by any amendment which has been adopted, and I think the action of this House in reducing these appropriation bills to the extent they have been and will be reduced in the future will meet the almost unanimous approval of the people of the United States and save the taxpayers a lot of money.

The amendment which I have offered proposes to cut back investigating funds of the Fish and Wildlife Service by \$171,000, and I select that figure because it reduces the appropriation to the sum that they had for expenditure last year, and this proposed amendment merely cuts them back to what they had a year ago. I believe that all of the nonmilitary agencies, almost without exception, ought to be able to get along in this time of great emergency when we are spending so much money for national defense, on the appropriations that they had last year.

I was activated in offering this amendment because of a visit I had the other day from an indignant constituent. He brought me a booklet published by the Wildlife Service in the course of its investigations and researches. That book is put out by this agency. It consists of 150-some pages, and is profusely illustrated with lithograph cuts. It is printed on the best gloss paper that can be found. It is devoted to the touching subject of raccoons in North and Middle America.

Mr. Chairman, raccoons were of some importance formerly to make fur coats for college boys, but since that time has passed and that has gone out of fashion, I do not know of anything more useless than the raccoon. I do not know why this book should ever have been published. Certainly there is no particu-

lar scientific reason for going into the formation of the skull of the raccoon. For instances, 20 pages are devoted to pictures showing the difference in the shape of the skull of the raccoon in Alabama from that in Florida and other States. I am wondering whether it was put out for the benefit of coon hunters.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I was wondering if the gentleman would find it possible to quote from that book on the love life of the coons?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I cannot quote from some of the pages of the book without being unparliamentary, and I do not wish to do that.

If this book was put out for the benefit of coon hunters it was a great mistake. In my early life I have known a lot of coon hunters and the best coon hunters I have ever known could not read or write; so it certainly would not do them any good. If you told a coon hunter that a coon was a "Procyon lotor" he would think you just had one swig too many out of that jug of "white mule" that usually goes with all well organized coon hunts.

My friend from Georgia is evidently familiar with this book. This book was gotten up apparently by some bureaucrat who took the trouble to go all the way down to Alabama which was the scene of the thing I am going to try to describe without being unparliamentary.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I should like to correct the gentleman and say that the historical incident occurred on Blackbeards Island in Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Evidently this Government employee went many hundreds of miles from Washington, presumably in one of these 4,500 cars now owned by the Department of the Interior. Perhaps he had a Government chauffeur. A great many of them do.

He went down to watch the love affair of a pair of raccoons in the swamps. He describes it accurately in the book. He describes the intimate details of the love affair, and the ultimate commission of the misdemeanor which in due course of time was calculated to produce another litter of raccoons in the swamps down there. That aroused my curiosity to some extent. I think it is all right to watch wildlife and to watch raccoons. Certainly as a private enterprise nobody is going to object to that. No one can criticize or complain about that except the coons themselves and there is nothing they can do about it. I am not criticizing the man as an individual who watched this misdemeanor. I merely talk about the wasteful expenditure of Government funds.

Some of my constituent's indignation having communicated itself to me, I took the trouble to get some copies of the numerous publications put out by the Wildlife Service in the investigation of our wild life resources. Here they are, and these will tell you what kind of animals they have been investigating. They have written scientific treatises on everything from the Collard lizards to the scissor-tailed fly catcher, including

ing skunks, squirrels, woodchucks, magpies, bats, and, believe it or not, there is a scientific treatise of great moment on the compelling subject of the economic status of the English sparrow. I hope you gentlemen will read that. It may help you in considering some of these appropriation bills.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my statement is to bring to your attention the utterly silly, foolish waste of money in every appropriation bill that comes before this Congress. I want to use this illustration as a matter of encouragement to these Members of Congress, a majority of whom have been willing to stand up here in the last few days and vote their convictions on cutting down these appropriations where they saw it could be done without hurting the Government service. You can take every one of these agencies and find waste. I have been talking about fish and wildlife. You did not know that the sex life of the fish had now come under the jurisdiction of the State Department. I do not know what kind of diplomatic relations have to be carried on to produce more fish, but the fact is in recent hearings before the Committee on Appropriations a great controversy arose, and it was discussed as to whether these machinations between fish should be termed the "love life" of the fish or the "sex life" of the fish. But, it seems that the State Department has an annual appropriation to investigate the habits of the tuna fish. It may be all right; I do not know, but it seems to me if they have to investigate all the habits of all the creatures that God put on the earth, creatures that have been reproducing themselves ever since Noah turned the first two out of the Ark, there is not anything the bureaucrats can do about it. God put them here and God told them what to do about it, and these bureaucrats just cannot change it.

Now, why are we spending the taxpayers money on such utter, ridiculous, foolishness as this? I think this appropriation could be cut drastically. I just ask you to cut it back to size, the same size as it was last year, and I do not think they ought to be rewarded with \$171,000 extra money for sending somebody down with a spyglass to Georgia to be a "Peeping Tom" to a pair of raccoons.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to support the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. The Fish and Wildlife Service have during the past year shown a stubborn and uncompromising attitude in its relations with sportsmen of Minnesota. Attempts made by Minnesotans to secure consideration of their

complaints of discrimination against our State have been ignored or brushed aside.

It is time to analyze a service such as this. Let us serve notice upon this bureau that it cannot secure all the funds it wishes from the Congress without giving an account of its stewardship to the people we represent.

The following news release from the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer Press of March 11, entitled "United States Duck Charges Untrue," Says Moscrip, is an answer to unfair statements made by Dr. Clarence Cotton, assistant to Albert M. Day. Perhaps the Fish and Wildlife Service does need a talking to by this Congress. A cut in its funds is the most respected admonition of all. The article follows:

"UNITED STATES DUCK CHARGES UNTRUE," SAYS MOSCRIP—FIGHT FOR EQUALITY TO GO ON

(By Lytton Taylor)

"Statements by Dr. Clarence Cottam at the North American Wildlife Conference in Milwaukee are not in accordance with the facts," W. S. Moscrip, president of the St. Paul Association of Commerce, declared in a statement Saturday.

The association is engaged in a campaign to end discriminations against Minnesota in duck and goose hunting regulations which are prescribed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service in Washington.

The campaign is supported by the Minnesota Game Protective League, the Ramsey County Sportsmen's Association, a considerable portion of the State legislature and Minnesota's Senators and Representatives in Congress. During the last week communities throughout the State have been sending the association assurances of support.

Cottam, who is assistant to Albert M. Day, director of the wildlife service, in his paper at Milwaukee singled out Minnesota as the great troublemaker in waterfowl management and called its demands unfair and unreasonable.

The wildlife service for several years has been broadcasting contentions that Minnesota already is taking more than its fair share of ducks, and that consequently it is unreasonable for it to seek correction of inequities.

Moscrip's statement is the sequel to an original protest to Day, Day's reply and a second letter by the association, plus correspondence with Members of Congress, including a declaration by Senator EDWARD J. THYE that "Minnesota's duck hunters are not a greedy group and are entitled to fair and just consideration."

The statement by Moscrip follows:

"The statements of Dr. Clarence Cottam, assistant to Albert M. Day, Director of the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service, at the North American wildlife conference in Milwaukee, are not in accordance with the facts regarding the number of our wild fowl and fair bag limits and seasons and equitable treatment.

"First and foremost, Minnesota is not asking for big bag limits or long seasons, but only for fair treatment and equality. Minnesota sportsmen resent the discrimination of lesser bag limits and shorter seasons of the neighboring States of North and South Dakota.

"This is particularly a tough condition where South Dakota completely bars Minnesota duck hunters, although residents of South Dakota may freely hunt and fish in Minnesota.

"Further, North Dakota permits only one limit of eight ducks to be taken out of their State by nonresidents and is considering

more stringent regulations regarding non-residents.

"Minnesota, along with North Dakota, raises more ducks than any other State and has a good flight of migrating wild fowl, yet Dr. Cottam says but 20 percent of the ducks are in our Mississippi flyway.

"We question this. Then Dr. Cottam reverses his argument and claims we have a maximum number of hunters and a maximum kill.

"The Fish and Wildlife Service claims a far greater supply of ducks for the Dakotas than Minnesota. Experienced hunters in this area will not agree with this. Our duck hunters who have covered the three States believe available ducks are about on a par in the Dakotas and Minnesota.

"This move for equality of treatment is now backed by over 65,000 sportsmen in Minnesota; has the backing of our Representatives in Washington, and Minnesota's sportsmen will stay in the fight until they have been accorded proper seasons and bag limits."

Day's letter to Moscrip attributes the Minnesota contentions to "some false assumptions." He asserts that to grant equality in hunting bags and seasons to Mississippi flyway States would only mean the unnecessary dragging of the other flyways down to our level.

The Central flyway, beginning at Minnesota's western border, last year had 45 days of hunting and the Pacific flyway 55 days, compared to 35 days here.

To justify this, Day repeats the figures used by Cottam. They credit the Mississippi flyway was 20 percent of the birds, 43 percent of the hunters, and 46 percent of the bill. The Central, according to these figures, has 29 percent of the ducks, but only 18 percent of the gun pressure.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I like the gentleman who preceded me in the well very much. I think he is one of the finest and most intelligent Members of this House. Maybe the gentleman is like MIKE KIRWAN, he probably never shot a gun in his life.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I would just like to observe what has been said for many, many years, that fish is good brain food. There might be some merit in the development of fish.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman. I want to say this. Twenty-six million people in the United States last year bought fishing and hunting licenses. There are only about 12,000,000 who are members of fraternal organizations, but this is the biggest organization, larger than all fraternal organizations put together. It is about the only thing in the United States that is not subsidized by the Government. They turned back more money into the Treasury last year than the Government spent on fish and wildlife. Twenty-six million people throughout this Nation are engaged in that pastime. I do not think there is a community in this country where you will not find during the hunting season men going out into the woods for this wonderful recreation. Yes, there are thousands of them. They are entitled to some consideration. The manufac-

turers of hunting and fishing equipment constitute one of the biggest industries of this Nation. Think of the 26,000,000 people buying fishing outfits, clothes for hunting, gum boots, hats, and so forth. Look at the industry being supported, such as manufacturing outboard motors, supplying gasoline, making automobiles—some of the biggest businesses in the world. On top of that, we are thinking about cutting \$171,000 for these fish and wildlife investigations. This Fish and Wildlife Service is getting in the bill now \$1,000,000 below the figure they got this year. Let us look at what the gentleman wants us to cut out of this bill. What have the people up in New England been urging for the past few years? The late Representative from Massachusetts, if he were here today, would be the first one to defend this organization. Up in his district they used to go out to sea in boats to fish off the Newfoundland coast. Now they see that industry is coming to an end, and they are beginning to urge research. Down on the Gulf they do a lot of protesting also. They want an investigation about the fish in the Gulf of Mexico, and out on the west coast as well. So, that is why the \$171,000 was put into this bill. I do not think there is a man or woman on the floor of this House who, if he or she will stop and think, will recall reading that years ago shad were taken out of the Delaware River and sold for a dollar a cart and used for fertilizer. Years ago there were plenty of sturgeon in Lake Erie and today there is probably not one in it. They are coming to an end, and coming to an end fast, like the rest of our resources, because we want to cut this appropriation \$171,000 by having somebody come down in the well of this House and telling a funny story.

I am asking you to think seriously of what you are trying to do here today. I again say that in the Pacific they have been calling for years for fishery investigations and studies. They have been calling for research on their fishery resources down in the Gulf and up in New England. And why are we in here today to cut \$171,000? Before the emergency committee to which I belong this was listed as an emergency item. They came before that committee, Charles Wilson, Harrison, and the others, asking for more funds in this emergency for fishery activities.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Is it not true that the New England area has requested funds for investigation of their fish resources, that California has been asking for an investigation in connection with tuna, and the State of Virginia has been receiving quite a bit of money for an investigation of a fish comparable to herring, whose name I cannot think of at the moment? From my service on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I know that Norfolk and the area around it have a big stake in the fishery resources.

Mr. KIRWAN. Down on the Gulf they have been calling for an investigation of shrimp and the different fish

down there. The same is true all over the Nation.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Washington has asked for a study of tuna. Is there money in here for the study of tuna?

Mr. KIRWAN. There is money in here for the study of all fish.

Mr. STEFAN. Tuna also?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKETT. Is part of the \$171,000 that the committee wants to leave in here for an investigation of how to control vagrant cats?

Mr. KIRWAN. I refer that to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. We nearly lost the tuna fish on the Pacific coast, and tuna is one of the most important sources of food, because we do not know enough about the biology of the tuna, we do not know enough about the love life of the tuna, to know how to protect it.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KIRWAN) there were—ayes 69, noes 61.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JACKSON of Washington and Mr. SMITH of Virginia.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 117, noes 84.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including expenses of the Offices of the Governors of Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, the Government of the Virgin Islands, including the agricultural station, and of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; compensation and mileage of members of the legislatures in Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and American Samoa; compensation and expenses of the judiciary in American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; care of insane as authorized by law for Alaska (48 U. S. C. 46-50); grants to the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, in addition to current local revenues, for support of governmental functions; and personal services, household equipment and furnishings, and utilities necessary in the operation of the several Governors' houses, and the residence of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; \$7,020,000: *Provided*, That the territorial and local governments of the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands are authorized to make pur-

chases through the General Services Administration.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph beginning on page 32, line 17, and extending to line 16 on page 33, which language is as follows:

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES
ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including expenses of the Offices of the Governors of Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, the Government of the Virgin Islands, including the agricultural station, and of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; compensation and mileage of members of the legislatures in Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and American Samoa; compensation and expenses of the judiciary in American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; care of insane as authorized by law for Alaska (48 U. S. C. 46-50); grants to the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, in addition to current local revenues, for support of governmental functions; and personal services, household equipment and furnishings, and utilities necessary in the operation of the several Governors' houses, and the residence of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; \$7,020,000: *Provided*, That the territorial and local governments of the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands are authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration.

On the ground that it is legislation upon an appropriation bill and not authorized by law. The entire paragraph is legislation and the only thing that should properly be contained in the paragraph is an appropriation to carry out the functions presently vested in the Office of Territories.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] on the point of order.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish to direct the attention of the Chair to Forty-eighth United States Code, section 62, section 63, section 65 (b), and, in addition, again to Forty-eighth United States Code, section 46, section 47 (b), section 48, section 536, section 539, section 1405 (s), and section 1405 (v).

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman advise the Chair as to the effect of the provisions to which he has referred?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think it might be helpful to the Chair to mention that there may be one or two lines that would be subject to a point of order. But the sections to which I have called the attention of the Chair specifically cover the language in the bill. Forty-eighth United States Code, section 62, provides that the Governor shall receive basic compensation at the rate of \$15,000 per annum, payable from the Treasury of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to interrupt the gentleman. Did the Chair understand the gentleman from Washington to say that there may be two or three lines within this section or paragraph that would be subject to a point of order?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has, therefore, conceded the point of order. A portion of a paragraph being out of order, the entire paragraph is subject to a point of order; and the Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON of Washington: Page 32, after line 16, insert:

"Office of Territories, Administration of Territories: For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior for expenditure as authorized by law, \$7,020,000."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is any controversy on the amendment as submitted. I, therefore, ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior (referred to herein as the Secretary), including teletype rentals and service; \$2,365,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: Page 36, line 7, strike out "\$2,365,000" and insert "\$2,000,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I think this is another place in this bill where we can make a considerable cut in appropriations and still not impair the services rendered by this Department.

In 1950, before the Interior reorganization plan took effect, the appropriations for the Office of the Secretary amounted to \$1,913,781. The next year, for 1951, after the reorganization plan was accepted, the expenses of the Office of the Secretary rose from \$1,913,000 to \$2,290,000.

This reorganization plan, as a I recall, was intended to promote efficient operation and economy in the handling of matters coming before the Office of the Secretary. We cannot stand many more of these "economy" reorganization plans which increase appropriations and do the opposite of that which was intended. If we continue to do that, pretty soon we are going to "save" ourselves into bankruptcy.

The amendment which I have offered allows the Office of the Secretary more money than he had in 1950 but not quite as much as he had in 1951. He has now come in and asked for an additional \$75,000—even over and above the big appropriation given him for 1951, which was \$300,000 more than he had for 1950.

Now, the program of the Department presents no important new aspects or workloads, insofar as I am able to determine. I think we should do everything we can to hold the appropriation for this office at least to the level of 1950.

The distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], on yesterday, showed how these so-called economy reorganization plans eventually cost the taxpayers additional money. He showed how—between 1944 and 1949—they attempted to decentralize the operations of the Office of the Secretary to the field. They increased their employees in the field by 16,000 and reduced them in Washington, or headquarters, from 4,490 to 3,614. But in this decentralization process they opened a new Office of the Secretary in Denver, and staffed it with an additional 2,224 employees, making a net gain in the Office of the Secretary of 348 employees, in addition to 16,000 additional in the field as a result of this so-called decentralization plan. Now, all of that adds up to a tremendous additional cost to the taxpayers.

In 1950 the Department of the Interior, Office of the Secretary, received \$36,355 for traveling expenses. Last year—and again this year—the Secretary's office requested \$106,664 for traveling expenses, almost three times what it had in 1950. This is but a part of the waste which my amendment seeks to eliminate.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is reasonable. It should be adopted in the interest of economy and common sense.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

(Mr. KIRWAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, what I shall say at this time will not do much more good than what I have said during the week we have been debating this bill. However, we will feel embarrassed when they come back to the Congress asking for more money and it will put the Congress in the position of not knowing what the score is.

First, why an increase of \$75,000? Mr. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, has to sign certain certificates of necessity involving over a billion dollars. Are we going to give that billion dollars away without any investigation whatever? He has five times the work now that he had at any time before. In connection with every one of these certificates the Secretary of the Interior has got to know what it involves, whether it is in Pennsylvania, in Illinois, or wherever it may be. That \$1,600,000,000 has got to be put into circulation. Where is the money coming from to administer this work? Where are the people coming from who are going to make these investigations?

We want to cut out \$190,000 below the amount available for this year. If the Secretary were here and you asked him personally how his work next year will compare with this year he would tell you it will be five times greater. Yet we want to cut \$365,000 out of this and fix

it so that there can be no investigation or analysis of these certificates or anything like that. In other words, if this amendment is agreed to it will force the Government in effect to make a gift of \$1,600,000,000 without any investigation.

I hear people scream loud about the Marshall plan and about helping foreign countries, but I see them going down through the tellers here today and all during the past week protesting against spending a few dollars on America. Things have certainly gone a long way. Stop, look, and listen and observe the way you have voted. You were eager about the Marshall plan. I voted for it and I am glad it went into effect. I am not going to yell about patriotism but I do want to spend a few dollars on this country first. That is why I ask you not to cut this. It will not mean anything to me whether you cut every dime out of this bill. There is only a trifling sum in it for Ohio anyway, so it is not a case of logrolling.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Would this not put the Secretary in a very difficult position if we cut him back below the funds he has for this year, when you take into consideration all of the defense activities that have been assigned to the Department of the Interior since a year ago?

Mr. KIRWAN. Over \$66,000,000,000 will be appropriated for national defense. The Secretary of the Interior is one of the men who must play a most important part in that.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. They call on the Department of the Interior, the Geological Survey, the various power organizations, the Bureau of Mines—various agencies—for assistance and help so far as the other defense agencies of the Government are concerned, is that not true?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is what I told the gentleman from Washington. Before this \$66,000,000,000 is spent and before the fiscal ends, they will be coming back here for more millions. They are going to show us up for not knowing what we are legislating on or not knowing what we are appropriating for; and that we know very little about the running of the Government. Yes; we march up and down the aisle today and we want to cut a couple of dollars here and there, it will certainly show some of us up. The superior race that we think we are and that great law-making body that we want the rest of the world to think we are, may be put in doubt today.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand, whatever services are rendered for the Defense Department, there is reimbursement; is that not correct?

Mr. KIRWAN. No. Just like the gentleman from Washington said, when

they want something done it is not all reimbursed.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Well, but the share of the services rendered, as I understand, for the Defense Department is not charged to them.

Mr. KIRWAN. When they have to get some maps or something printed, the Army may pay their portion, yes, and that work in the Department of the Interior has increased considerably.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi) there were—ayes 59, noes 46.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 102. Appropriations made in this act shall be available for the purchase of station wagons without such vehicles being considered as passenger motor vehicles.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against this section on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington concedes the point of order and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I made a point of order against this paragraph not for the purpose of trying to handicap the Department in its operations. On first reading of the paragraph somebody might get the impression that the Department would be restricted in its operations, if this paragraph were left in the bill. We would not accomplish the purposes of the amendments that were offered by the gentleman from Mississippi taking out of the bill the authority for the purchase of additional passenger automobiles. This paragraph that has been deleted says that station wagons are not to be considered as passenger motor vehicles. If this paragraph had been left in the bill, there would have been no limitation upon the number of station wagons which could have been purchased, and a station wagon, of course, is a passenger vehicle. The Department will not be handicapped in its transportation because they can, under the law, purchase carry-alls, which are trucks with passenger-carrying facilities. In fact, the carry-all, in my opinion, will suit the purposes much better than the station wagon. A carry-all can be bought for possibly anywhere from \$300 to \$600 less than a station wagon. It is a more practical type of vehicle, the body being mounted on a truck chassis, with heavier springs, heavier constructed, will last longer, and will perform better service. I think this should be an indication not only to this Department but to other departments of Government that this Congress is interested in economy. We do know that we have too many automo-

biles in the service of the various departments and that these cars are being used indiscriminately. I think that the Government is imposed upon by some of its employees, and I hope that other departments will learn that Congress is not only interested in economy but we are going to insist on economy. We are going to scrutinize more carefully the requests that are made. While some of the objections that are being made here might seem small, I think the principle involved may have a good effect on the employees of this Government and let them know that the people of America are interested in seeing that our tax dollars are wisely spent.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 104. Appropriations in this act available for travel expenses shall be available, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, for expenses of attendance of officers and employees at meetings or conventions of members of societies or associations concerned with the work of the bureau or office for which the appropriation concerned is made.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against section 104 that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and involves additional duties.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand that the gentleman from New York raises objection to the paragraph because of the use of the language "under regulations prescribed by the Secretary" in lines 18 and 19?

Mr. KEATING. I do object to those words, and feel that that makes the section out of order as it now stands, but I would still press the point of order even with those words eliminated.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I wonder if the gentleman would accept the section if it remains as is except for the elimination of the words "under regulations prescribed by the Secretary."

Mr. KEATING. I feel that even with the elimination of those words it would still involve legislation on an appropriation bill, for exactly the same reasons for which the Chair has held section 102 subject to a point of order.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. It is section 104 with the words I mentioned deleted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON of Washington: On page 36, line 17, insert the following:

"SEC. 104. Appropriations in this act available for travel expenses shall be available for expenses of attendance of officers and employees at meetings or conventions of members of societies or associations concerned with the work of the bureau or office for which the appropriation concerned is made."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it involves legislation on an appropriation bill and is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish to invite the attention of the Chair to Thirty-first United States Code, page 551, which reads as follows:

Unless specifically provided by law, no moneys from funds appropriated for any purpose shall be used for the purpose of lodging, feeding, conveying, or furnishing transportation to any conventions or other form of assemblage or gathering to be held in the District of Columbia or elsewhere.

Then Fifth United States Code, section 83:

No money appropriated by any act shall be expended * * * for expenses of attendance of any person at any meeting or convention of members of any society or association, unless such fees, dues, or expenses are authorized to be paid by specific appropriations for such purposes or are provided for in express terms in some general appropriation.

The committee merely has carried out the authorizing legislation which leaves to the Committee on Appropriations the determination in that regard.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. It seems to me the argument advanced by the gentleman from Washington is a negative argument and is not sound. It is stated that these expenditures are not permitted unless expressly authorized by law. That means unless authorized in the proper legislative manner. It does not give authority nor could it, I believe, alter the rules of the House to give authority to legislate on an appropriation bill. Any legislation which would authorize an expenditure of this nature should be taken up as a separate measure. There is nothing in the reference which the gentleman has made which authorizes us in an appropriation bill to take the action which he now seeks to take.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. In response to the gentleman from New York, I would like to state that the effect of the committee's action in this particular section 104 is not to add anything that would place an additional burden on the Congress, but it merely implements, rather than adding to something which is authorized by law. I think that is the basic distinction involved.

May I point out to the chairman that while I refer to two sections, the first citation being Thirty-first United States Code, page 551, I think the principal statute in point is Five United States Code, section 83.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington has called the attention of the Chair to section 83, title 5 of the United States Code. Permit the Chair to read the language contained in that provision:

No money appropriated by any act shall be expended for membership fees or dues of any officer or employee of the United States or of the District of Columbia, in any society or association or for expenses of attendance of any person at any meeting or convention of members of any society or association unless such fees, dues, or expenses are author-

ized to be paid by specific appropriations for such purposes or are provided for in express terms in some general appropriation.

The Chair feels that the language which has just been read governs the matter and overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from New York.

Does the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] desire to speak on the amendment he has offered?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 109. During the current fiscal year the head of any department or establishment of the Government having funds available for scientific and technical investigations within the scope of the functions of the Department of the Interior may, with the approval of the Secretary, transfer to the Department such sums as may be necessary therefor, which sums so transferred may be expended for the same objects and in the same manner as sums appropriated herein but without their limitations.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language in section 109 on the ground that it is legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Washington a question.

Why should not the figure in the next section which we are coming to be 1951? There is no contract authority that will not be obligated in the Bonneville section and none that I can find in the index on reclamation, and it would seem that we ought to do that, and not have it run beyond the fiscal year 1951.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I will answer the gentleman from New York by saying it is my understanding there is a proposed hospital in the Virgin Islands which would be adversely affected by the language change suggested by the gentleman from New York. Other than that I understand there would not be any vital objection.

Mr. TABER. Why could we not change it so that we would except that one item because having a lot of this contract authority kicking around apparently is bad practice.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think if the gentleman would offer an amendment to the effect that it would except the item for the Virgin Islands public works, it would be acceptable to the committee and would not work any hardship. At least that is the best information I have available to me at this moment. If the gentleman wishes to offer the amendment, the committee will accept it.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 110. The balances of all contract authorizations heretofore granted to the Interior Department or any of its bureaus or offices, which remain unused on June 30, 1952, are hereby rescinded.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 39, line 1, strike out "1952" and insert "1951"; and at the end of line 2 strike out the period, insert a comma and add: "except a hospital in the Virgin Islands."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think if the gentleman would modify his amendment to read "public works" it would be acceptable. I do not know whether it is hospital or hospitals.

Mr. TABER. I will modify the amendment, then, Mr. Chairman, to read "public works."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 39, line 1, strike out "1952" and insert "1951"; and at the end of line 2 strike out the period, insert a comma and add: "except public works in the Virgin Islands."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 111. Transfers to the Department of the Interior, pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, of equipment, material and supplies, excess to the needs of Federal agencies may be made at the request of the Secretary without reimbursement or transfer of funds when required by the Department for operations conducted in Territories and island possessions.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against section 111 on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 112. No part of the funds made available by this act may be used to compensate any person for employment in the Federal service outside the continental limits of the United States at a rate higher than is paid for comparable work in the Federal service within the continental limits of the United States, other than a person who was a resident citizen of the continental United States at the date of his appointment to a position outside the continental limits of the United States and has had continuous employment in the Federal service (except as interrupted by service in the Armed Forces of the United States) from the date of such appointment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT: On page 39 strike out all of section 112.

The CHAIRMAN. The Delegate from Alaska is recognized.

(Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman—Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the committee for accepting this amendment. There was every

good reason for its adoption, and I say objectively there was not a single reason for enactment of section 112.

The section would set up discriminatory pay practices as among Federal employees. What it says, in effect, is that the cost-of-living allowance shall hereafter be paid in the Territories and possessions of the United States, and elsewhere, only to those persons who were recruited within the States. That is discrimination at its worst. That is colonialism magnified beyond all proper boundaries. If the Federal Government adopts one pay standard for Americans working outside the States and another standard for Americans working alongside them and doing precisely the same jobs, the propaganda machinery of Communist nations will be called into play against us. And we shall have no proper answer. For we shall have been found guilty in the eyes of the world of setting up a minority group merely because of their geographic location.

I do not know why this section is carried in the bill. It is reported or, rather, removed that similar language may be considered in reference to other appropriation bills still to be acted upon by the House. Every such effort should be defeated.

Section 112, in effect, says that if Sam Smith is hired from New York City to perform a job in Alaska, he shall receive in addition to the base pay for that job a differential of 25 percent in recognition of the higher cost of living there. But if Richard Roe is recruited within Alaska for exactly the same kind of job, he would not receive the differential payment. By some strange process of reasoning it is indicated that living costs will not bear upon him with the same weight as upon Sam Smith. How this could be so remains a baffling puzzle.

As a matter of principle, my amendment should be accepted without argument. We cannot afford to be so mean, to be so inconsiderate, to write into law such a dangerous provision as this.

We have been all through this before. For several years the differential was paid under a voluntary agreement among the executive departments of the Government under the sponsorship of the Civil Service Commission.

In 1948 the administrative practice of paying a differential was written into law in section 207 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for 1949, as amended by section 104 of the Supplemental Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1949. That section, briefly, provided for the payment of additional compensation based on living costs substantially higher than in the District of Columbia to persons stationed outside the continental United States or in Alaska. The additional compensation was to be paid in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President. Subsequently, on September 16, 1948, the President signed Executive Order 10000, which set forth the system of cost-of-living allowances, payment of post differentials, additional compensation by reason of environment, and so forth. In no case, however, was the application of one kind of differential or

a combination of differentials to exceed the 25-percent limit placed by the law.

With reference to Alaska and following the issuance of regulations and findings of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Civil Service Commission issued regulations allowing a cost-of-living allowance of 25 percent to Federal employees in Alaska. This determination was made when it was found that living costs in all places in the Territory were at least 25 percent higher than the District of Columbia, and in most places living costs far exceeded that limit.

Back in 1945, and while the voluntary agreement regarding differentials was in effect, a determined effort was made by one agency of Government—to its everlasting shame—to induce the other departments to set up standards which would have had precisely the same effect as section 112. That agency argued that the differential was not a cost-of-living allowance but was a recruitment device. That it was not, and no amount of argument can make it such. It was such a device only insofar as it reflected the need for paying the differential in the Territories in recognition of higher living costs. That effort was beaten, and I had thought and hoped it would never be revived.

Now, what actually happened after the Independent Offices Acts referred to above became law and the Executive order was subsequently issued by the President was that Federal employees receiving the differential actually suffered that which was equivalent to a pay cut.

Prior to the effective date of the Executive order every employee paid income tax on his base salary plus the differential. Likewise, retirement deductions were made from his gross salary. Subsequently, however, although he was compelled to pay income tax on the base salary plus the cost-of-living allowance, retirement deductions were not made from that allowance. That was equivalent to a pay cut. So, I submit that Federal employees in the Territories and possessions have been the only group of Federal employees during the postwar period who have suffered the equivalent of a pay reduction.

Speaking for Alaska, because I am better acquainted with the situation there, let me state, and most emphatically, that if there are any who believe that enactment of section 112 would be an economy move, they are absolutely and positively wrong. Of course, that is obvious on the surface. Alaskans who have been recruited in their homeland and work for the Federal Government do not have access to mysterious sources which would enable them to live for less than their coworkers from elsewhere. They must patronize the same grocery stores, go to the same clothing stores, pay the same fees to the same doctors and pay the same rent as their fellow workers from the States. We have talked much about developing Alaska, inducing more people to go there to live so as to build it up economically. Such discrimination as is proposed by section 112 will not aid in this cause. In this day, for reasons which are apparently sound, the Gov-

ernment pays the transportation costs for the majority of its workers. If section 112 is enacted, Alaskans will have to quit. They cannot—and I state that as a categorical fact with respect to most of them—exist without the differential. Then what will Government do? Well, naturally, it will recruit others to take their places from the States, and they will receive the full differential plus transportation costs. Where is the saving there? It simply does not exist.

It may not be tremendously important, but I can think of one of the heads of two Interior Department bureaus in Alaska who are Alaskans and who were hired there. If they stayed on their jobs if section 112 should prevail—which they probably would not—they would be in the strange position of having several of their subordinates receive larger salary checks than they.

Now, there is no requirement that the maximum 25 percent differential be paid. It is to be granted only if the cost of living figures reflect its need. If it is ascertained that the cost of living in any particular area or even a particular subregion of a territory is only 16 percent higher, for example, than in the District of Columbia, that is the figure which will be allowed for cost-of-living compensation.

It so happens that in Alaska, Federal employees, whether recruited locally or otherwise, are subjected to living costs which are not compensated for by the cost-of-living allowance. Only last Thursday the Bureau of Labor Statistics released the findings of a survey made this year at the instance of the Senate Armed Services Committee. It was discovered that the cost of living in Fairbanks in February was 47 percent higher than in Seattle. And it was 40 percent higher in Anchorage than in Seattle. Seattle, it should be remembered, was a cheaper city in which to live in February of this year than was Washington, D. C.

If section 112 should prevail we should not only find outright discrimination against territorial residents but varying practices among the departments themselves.

Two appropriation bills have passed the House already with no such section included, namely, the bills for the Treasury and Post Office and Labor and Federal Security. The independent offices appropriation bill was reported out late last week without containing language which is offered in section 112.

We in Alaska are becoming weary of these onslaughts against us. We seek statehood; but we receive no increased measure whatsoever of home rule. We are American citizens. We do not know why our people should command less for their labor than any other Americans. All we ask is justice. And justice will not be afforded by section 112. I have not noted that there has been a proposal that those American citizens in Alaska who will be almost legally designated as second class by such proposed legislation as this would have their income-tax payments to the Federal Government diminished in any measure. They pay the same taxes as do the citizens of any

of the States. They ought to have equality of treatment.

I thank you to adopt this amendment.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the committee chairman to explain the meaning of section 110:

The balances of all contract authorizations heretofore granted to the Interior Department or any of its bureaus or offices, which remain unused on June 30, 1952, are hereby rescinded.

Does that mean that the policy-making committees of the House that have to do with the Department of the Interior, will have to reauthorize all authorizations that have not been used up on the date named.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I assume the gentleman is familiar with the policy followed by the Committee on Appropriations prior to this year. That policy involved the granting to the departments of certain contract authority; in other words, they could contract and obligate the credit of the Government so as to do specific work without having the cash appropriated to them. Subsequently the Congress after the indebtedness had been incurred would appropriate the money for the contractual obligations that had been heretofore incurred.

Starting with this year, that is fiscal year 1952, the policy was adopted by the committee and the Congress to do away with contract authority and appropriate only in cash. This amendment is for the purpose of carrying out the new policy and for no other reason. It does not upset any basic legislation.

Mr. DEWART. This section states "contract authorization." That is only limited to contract authorization existing; for instance, the 1944 Flood Control Act authorizations would not be affected?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I do not know by what stretch of the imagination it could apply to it.

Mr. DEWART. It states that all contract authorizations shall be rescinded on a certain date.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Yes, but that is in the Department of the Interior. The Flood Control Act of 1944, except as to the marketing of power, hardly comes within the Department of the Interior.

Mr. DEWART. The gentleman is in error about that, because the Missouri Basin authorization is largely under the 1944 act.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That may be true, but that is the exception.

Mr. DEWART. And I wonder if all that authorization, and I believe there is a balance of some \$500,000,000 that has not been used, would end under the provisions of this section.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. This provision relates only to contract authority involving the appropriation of money. I assume the gentleman is referring to basic legislation authorizing the construction of projects.

Mr. DEWART. That is right.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. This has nothing to do with that. All that it relates to is the change in policy which

has been agreed to by the Appropriations Committee eliminating contract authority in the appropriation bills.

Mr. DEWART. However, it does not say "appropriations." It says "authorizations." That is what was disturbing me. I refer to line 24.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think the colloquy here certainly will explain it satisfactorily if there is any doubt at all regarding the basic authority on the subject.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWART. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I would like to ask whether under the amendment previously offered hospitals are excluded from this rescission of authority?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. As the amendment was agreed to here a moment ago, the only exception made was for a hospital or hospitals in the Virgin Islands. It is the understanding of the committee there are no other hospital projects that would be affected by the language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. There may be some hospitals. I have one in mind that might be affected and I want to make sure what the language means.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I will say to the gentleman that there is no intention by the amendment to impound that. It is my understanding that the Bureau of the Budget has impounded funds under section 1214 of the General Appropriation Act, second session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Is the gentleman referring to the County Hospital at Albuquerque, N. Mex.?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That has not been impounded.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I may be in error.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts

the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence, and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That in cases of emergency, caused by fire, flood, storm, act of God, or sabotage, persons may be employed for periods of not more than 30 days and be paid salaries and wages without the necessity of inquiring into their membership in any organization.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing in the bill beginning with line 13, page 41, reading: "who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States," and just that language. As I understand it both the AFL and CIO assert this right though as a matter of policy they have refused to exercise it. I think this is a loosely drawn criminal statute written into an appropriation bill.

I also offer a point of order against the same language appearing in line 4 through line 7, page 42. I limit my point of order to that language on those two pages.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair understand the language on page 42 to which the gentleman refers. Will the gentleman be specific as to the language he has in mind?

Mr. YORTY. Starting with the word "or" in line 4 and ending after the words "United States" in line 7.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the entire section on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington makes a point of order against the entire section on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I made the point of order against the entire section merely to eliminate a dismembered provision which would remain after the point of order made by the gentleman from California. My action does not indicate opposition on my part to the philosophy of this provision. This affords an opportunity to restore the entire provision later.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Page 42, after line 21, insert "No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to the bill which is in effect the same amendment

I offered to the Labor and Federal Security bill which we considered last week and which was carried decisively.

There is a growing suspicion on the part of the people of this country that Government agencies and departments are in the publicity and propaganda business on a wholesale scale and that we are spending millions and millions of dollars uselessly every year for that purpose.

Last evening I happened to be at a dinner and a Government employee was one of the principal speakers. He pointed out how the Government was directing public thinking in the smaller communities of this country. The thought occurs to me and I wonder why the Government is engaged in the business of directing public thinking. This amendment is merely an effort to stop that practice. It will, if adopted, limit the use of the funds appropriated in this act.

I hope that this great Committee on Appropriations one of these days will give some thought and consideration to the problem of finding out definitely and specifically just how much money we are spending for propaganda and publicity purposes. I may be mistaken, and if I am, I would like to be corrected. It may be that the Eighty-first Congress made some effort to investigate this matter but I find no record of it. However, the Eightieth Congress did go into this matter and I want to refer to part of a report of the special committee investigating the subject of publicity and propaganda—House Report 2474. On page 9 of that report the committee goes on to make this very vital observation, it seems to me. It says:

During the brief period of its operation your committee was called upon to investigate so many complaints of specific violations it was impossible to give the time and consideration necessary for proposing a solution to the over-all problem. It feels that its investigations and work have briefly outlined a problem which is alarming in its enormity.

Now that is a job of this great Committee on Appropriations, as I see it. Continuing, the report says:

However, it feels that further intensive study is necessary not only to reveal a more complete picture of this situation but to formulate an effective safeguard against this danger. It feels strongly that further legislation is necessary, but is hesitant, on the basis of its work to date, to make specific recommendations. It recognizes there is a fine line between legitimate information service, and activity on the part of agencies and individuals which is designed to condition the public mind, and cautions that it will take legislation drawn with meticulous care to prevent improper action without infringing on legitimate services or the rights of the individual public official.

I hope that the committee will see fit to accept this amendment. It is merely a restraint upon governmental agencies that have a tendency and a disposition to propagandize every piece of legislation that is in contemplation or every piece of law that it has on the books today.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent

that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

(Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, as the debate and consideration of the Interior appropriations bill draws to a close I take this opportunity in behalf of my Iowa colleagues and myself to thank the members of the Interior Subcommittee of Appropriations, of which I am a Member, for their unanimous approval of the funds provided in this bill for the construction of a high voltage transmission line from Fort Randall Dam to or near Sioux City, Iowa.

My Iowa colleagues, Mr. HOEVEN and Mr. DOLLIVER, were especially helpful by their urgent requests made to officers of the Bureau of Reclamation and to committee members to make future Missouri Valley power easily accessible to the people of Iowa by starting construction of this line in fiscal year 1952, in order to have that power available for use in Iowa when Fort Randall starts generation in 1954 or 1955.

Also, I want to say that Julius Lensch, now president of the REA of Iowa, came to Washington over two years ago as an official spokesman for a group of REA's in northwest Iowa, at which time he and I called on Michael Straus, Commissioner of Reclamation to complain about the fact that the Bureau's plans at that time did not propose a single transmission line to Iowa at any point. But our neighboring States to the west and northwest were to be covered with a network of lines. Mr. Lensch and the northwest Iowa group of REA officials deserve much credit for it was that day, and not until that day, and after considerable argument, that Mr. Straus finally agreed to include the line to Sioux City, Iowa, in their plans. That day we reminded Mr. Straus in no uncertain terms that the people of Iowa were heavy taxpayers and as such they were entitled to their fair share of the Missouri Valley power.

My colleagues, you know this is one of the few times during my thirteen years in Congress that I have asked the taxpayers of the whole Nation to provide something for my people. Thanks to all of you.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for offering this amendment. I think it was in 1946, in a Senate investigation, they called upon the Federal Government to come down and let this committee of the Senate have the information as to public relations, publicity, and propaganda, and what it was costing the Government. It was the Assist-

ant Director of the Budget, Mr. Lawton, who swore before that committee that they had about 25,000 people employed at a cost of about \$70,000,000 to the taxpayers. It has been suggested that we try to restrict propaganda, thought control, and unnecessary expense of publicity for various things that the Government is interested in in the various departments. We can do it by adopting this amendment. I am in favor of it. I hope the members will approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. No one can say it is a step in the wrong direction. It is a step in the right direction. The people want the Congress to take over greater control. There is a ground swell of opinion, evidenced by the letters and telegrams that have come to Members of Congress from all sections of the United States, for this great legislative body to take over greater control in the direction of the affairs of this country. This gives us the opportunity to implement the thoughts, the desire, and the wish of the people we represent, the people who are really the Government of the United States. I hope the Members will approve this very worthy amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON].

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this amendment for very good reasons. In the first place, I happen to be a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which of course has jurisdiction over many of the problems that come under the Department of the Interior.

I want to say that Mr. Mike Straus, who heads the Bureau of Reclamation, which originally was an engineering division of the Department of the Interior, always headed by the greatest engineers in the country, came into public life as a newspaperman. I have a great deal of respect for newspaper people, but Mr. Mike Straus does not practice the ethics usually attributed to newspapermen. He absolutely is a propagandist, with the most vicious tactics that can be employed by any governmental bureaucrat.

Take Mr. Bill Warne. He is an ex-newspaperman and publicist and propagandist. Boke, who handles the great central California project, is nothing but a propagandist. He also practices ethics not usually attributable to what we would call a good publicist or a good newspaperman.

I think this amendment is certainly needed in the Bureau of Reclamation, because if there is any department which absolutely puts out propaganda and lies—emphasis on the lies—it is the Bureau of Reclamation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call to the attention of the House the fact that the language contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is now the basic law of the land. It is my understanding that there are statutes dealing with this very subject. Naturally, I do not advocate that anyone be per-

mitted to violate these laws, but I see no point in adding language here that is already covered by basic law. I hope the gentleman is not trying to impute to the Department of the Interior some ulterior motive and of violating basic statutes passed by the Congress. I think that under all the circumstances there is absolutely no need for this amendment, inasmuch as it is contained in basic law. I hope the Committee will vote down the amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. An amendment like this, that is loosely drawn, does not mean anything. There is no definition in the amendment as to what a publication is, and there is no definition as to what propaganda is.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. And there is no penalty.

Mr. FOGARTY. They give no specific examples of any kind of what they allege is happening or as to what they want to correct by an amendment like this.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I see no need for it. It is simply surplusage.

Again I say, Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: Page 42, after line 21, insert a new section, as follows:

"No part of any appropriation or authorizations contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the agency;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies and school teachers in the Indian Service;

"(e) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2;

"(f) to law-enforcement officers;

"*Provided further*, That when any department or agency covered in this bill shall, as a result of the operation of this amendment, reduce their employment to a figure not exceeding 80 percent of the total number on their rolls as of July 1, 1951, such amendment shall cease to apply and said 80-percent figure shall become a ceiling for employment during the fiscal year 1952 and if exceeded at any time during fiscal year 1952 this amendment shall again become operative."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, it will be noted this is a similar amendment to the amendment I offered to the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill. It is not identical because of the fact it

is necessary to tailor each amendment of this nature to fit the different agencies of Government. So I shall point out the difference between this amendment and the amendment which I offered to the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill.

In this amendment I have exempted school teachers in the Indian Service schools, all nurses, doctors, and other medical personnel, including orderlies in the Indian hospitals, which, of course, is the only kind of hospital this bill applies to. Also I have exempted all law-enforcement officers. In the Park Service there are many law-enforcement officers, such as park rangers and also fish and wildlife game wardens, who are very necessary to protect the property of the parks and enforce the game laws, I have also provided when any department or agency covered in this bill shall as a result of the operation of this amendment reduce their employment to a figure not exceeding 80 percent of the total number on the payroll as of July 1, 1951, this provision shall cease to apply and said 80 percent figure shall become a ceiling for employment during the fiscal year 1952, and if exceeded at any time during the fiscal year 1952 this amendment shall again become operative.

You will note that that gives protection to an agency of Government which may have such a large turn-over that this amendment might detrimentally affect the operation of that agency and hence, after consulting with a number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, we decided to include this amendment which will act as a safeguard.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I am pleased to yield to the able gentlelady.

Mrs. CHURCH. I wish merely to commend the gentleman on the wisdom of his amendment and to report to him that no amendment to any bill which has been introduced in this session has received such universal commendation in the Thirteenth District of Illinois. The feeling is that this is an effective, practical, and very possible way of actually cutting appropriations. I would like also to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that many of the Federal employees themselves have pointed out that this is not out of keeping with their own wishes.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentlewoman.

May I say that many Federal employees have called me to say since I introduced the amendment to the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill, without giving their names which they dared not do, "We hope your amendment will be adopted, because it will give us a much better chance for promotion, instead of having some political hack come in and get the job which is rightfully ours, and who knows nothing about the job that is to be done."

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I am glad to yield to my friend, a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HORAN. This will result in getting more of the idle work done instead of wasting it on unnecessary manpower.

Mr. JENSEN. Exactly.

In the Bureau of Reclamation you will notice they request \$60,429,151 in this bill for personnel hire in the fiscal year 1952 while the bill provides \$207,000,000 for construction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Which amounts to almost exactly 30 percent of the total amount in this bill for the construction of irrigation reclamation and hydroelectric plants and related facilities for the Bureau of Reclamation. So you have a 30-percent administrative cost. As you travel throughout the Western States you will hear this request from most of the people in irrigation districts. They ask: "For goodness' sakes, can you not get some of this terrific administrative cost off our backs? They have a project office, a district office, a regional office, and every kind of office force you can imagine piled on our project costs." They have to pay the bill eventually. If this amendment is made law, it will give some relief to those good folks.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to my good colleague from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is the gentleman satisfied that this will in no way impair the efficiency of these departments?

Mr. JENSEN. Right. The proof of that is found in what Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller of the General Accounting Office has done. On April 15, 1946, he had 14,994 employees. Mr. Warren put this method into effect, and on April 15, 1946, last April 15, just 5 years later, he had cut that personnel to 6,996. He will tell you, as he told me, that the efficiency of his department has greatly improved during 5 years, that the morale is now high among the employees, because they know if they work and learn the job above them that their chance of getting that job is good. So it is good for the morale, it is good for the efficiency in Government, it is good for our taxpayers, and it is the painless way of reducing the terrific expenses of Federal employees, now in excess of 2,300,000 to the tune of about \$9,000,000,000 annually for the American people to pay in burdensome taxes.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the Jensen amendment is entirely impracticable in view of the administrative difficulties involved and in view of several other weak-

nesses. I do hope that some Members from the West in particular will listen carefully to this analysis of the Jensen amendment. I hope they do not find themselves in the embarrassing position of voting for this. There will probably be a roll call if it passes, and then it will be embarrassing for them to be calling up the Interior Department wanting to know why there is difficulty in their own area. I may add that there will be a lot of roll calls this afternoon in order that everybody may know just exactly where they stand on these very, very important amendments. Some of the more obvious administrative problems involved are:

First. The amount of administrative machinery and paper work involved in administering this restriction would be extremely expensive. Agencies would be forced to control replacements at a central point so as to fix priorities on needs in filling vacancies. In addition they would have to set up a system of reporting daily from field offices and from lower organization units in Washington to a central point and would have to process a large volume of correspondence or other notices authorizing employment. The additional work which would be placed upon top officials in making daily determinations as to which positions should be filled would not only be time-consuming and expensive, but would interfere with top-level policy responsibilities which should be exercised by officials at the levels involved. It is conceivable that justifications would need to be received almost daily on every vacancy in order to evaluate the need for filling vacancies. It can readily be seen that a tremendous amount of paper work and administrative analysis and evaluation would be required.

Second. It would be necessary to make a determination as to whether or not a vacancy actually exists or is created in connection with all positions reclassified, reassigned, or initially established. It would not only be difficult to make these determinations, but a great deal of additional workload would be placed upon the administrative machinery of the agencies.

Third. It would complicate the execution of the Veterans' Preference Act since an agency might find itself in a position where it would be unable to employ a veteran otherwise entitled to employment with the agency when less than four vacancies have occurred. It is possible that this situation might even require reduction in force to remove two or three additional employees in order to employ the veteran entitled to reemployment. This situation might also develop in connection with the return of employees with reemployment rights from defense agencies.

I might add there are a lot of men now engaged in or now on active duty in the armed services who have recently been called from their jobs to active duty. This is particularly true in connection with the Bonneville Power and the Reclamation Service where we have a lot of engineers and specialized technicians who are needed in the Defense Establishment.

Additional objections to the amendment are as follows:

First. Because the Jensen amendment is fairly specific and very drastic it is necessary to insert certain specific exemptions. But it does not cover all of the exemptions that should be made in order to protect vital Government activities. It would appear preferable to design legislation which could be applied across the board, since it is very difficult to draw a line in deciding upon which exemption should be provided for.

Second. If an agency desires to take advantage of this legislation, it can be done under the present provision. In view of the general practice throughout the Government of having many more positions classified and authorized than ever can be filled within funds available, it would be possible for such positions to be considered as vacancies as of June 30 and therefore be eligible to be filled any time during the year. As a matter of fact, certain types of clerical and low-grade professional positions are set up using one position description to cover any number of vacancies which can be filled through the AI process.

Third. The problem of policing the system set up by this law would undoubtedly be very expensive since it would require the establishment of position controls and other staffing controls and close policing not only within the agency or department but some type of policing by the General Accounting Office or the Civil Service Commission. Even then it is questionable whether or not such policing could be effective in view of the manner in which this restriction can be circumvented either intentionally or unintentionally.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it was only about 10 days ago that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] offered this same amendment to the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1952. He made certain exemptions at that time and as of today he is making other exemptions when he claims he is going to exempt the school teachers and I believe the nurses and maybe the doctors in the Indian service.

I found the same trouble in the Public Health Service 10 days ago when he offered the amendment exempting nurses, doctors, and orderlies, but said nothing about exempting the men and women it takes to run a hospital outside of doctors, nurses, and orderlies. There is not a hospital on an Indian reservation or anywhere else in the world that does not have to have help to run elevators, telephones, and what not. They have to have men to buy the food that they eat in the hospital, they have to have men and women to keep the books. But this does not apply to them at all. You are going to reduce that personnel.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman contend that by taking 20 percent of the people who are now employed in any department of Government would be disrupting that agency and the operation and administration of that agency when we know that on July 1 we are going to have at least 2,400,000 on the Federal payroll, costing the taxpayers of America over \$9,000,000,000 in the fiscal year 1952?

Mr. FOGARTY. I will give the gentleman a very honest and sincere answer to that question. The gentleman is a member of the subcommittee that considered this bill. Why did he not cut that in this committee before he came on the floor 20 percent here and there or where he thought they could stand it, and not be hurt, instead of offering a wildcat amendment like he has here this afternoon? That is the answer to the gentleman's question.

Mr. JENSEN. How does the gentleman know I did not try to cut?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know whether the gentleman did or not.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is a member of the committee. Why does he not ask some of the members of the committee to try to cut more than we cut.

Mr. FOGARTY. Let me ask the gentleman this question—

Mr. JENSEN. I voted for every cut here today on this bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Did the gentleman make any attempt to cut this bill 20 percent while he was on the committee?

Mr. JENSEN. Not exactly 20 percent, but I said there was too much personnel and I tried to cut it.

Mr. FOGARTY. How much did the gentleman try to cut it?

Mr. JENSEN. How does the gentleman expect me to answer that question at this time? Be reasonable.

Mr. FOGARTY. I am trying to be reasonable and sincere in this presentation.

Mr. JENSEN. Let me tell the gentleman something. The only thing the gentleman has against this amendment, and the rest of the people that want to pile all these employees on, is that after we put this amendment on all agencies, we are going to save the taxpayers of American at least a billion dollars, and we are going to get rid of a lot of useless, needless Federal employees who are sitting around doing exactly nothing today, and the gentleman knows that.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman does not know any more than I do how much this amendment will save. There is no way of knowing. He tacked an amendment on a year ago and he did not know where it was going to lead or who it was going to affect, and as a consequence it was kicked out in conference between the House and the Senate, just because it was not workable. I believe, we, the Members of Congress, have the responsibility of determining, agency by agency, how many personnel shall operate them, and it is our job as members of the subcommittee to go into these agencies as thoroughly as we can and to weed out everyone who we do not believe is doing

an essential job. That is our job before we appear before the House. If we have not done that, then we have not done our jobs.

Mr. JENSEN. I agree.

Mr. FOGARTY. And when we appear before the House, we are supposed to come before you with a bill that has weeded out all excess personnel. But, when you have debated this bill for 4 or 5 days, when you had a chance day in and day out to cut every single agency, and then come along and hamstringing these agencies downtown by applying an over-all cut like this, I say you are not doing justice to your job as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and you are not being fair to the Members of this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. I asked the bureau having charge of the old age and assistance checks how this amendment would affect them. That is an operation of the Government that has a rather low-paid personnel. They have a 36-percent turnover in high employment like we have at the present time. They will have 5,000 vacancies in the next fiscal year, and the only thing that they are doing is keeping records and seeing to it that the aged and the old and the infirm and the permanently disabled in every section of this country are getting their checks on time. And, when you have a 36 percent turnover it means that in the coming year they are going to have 3,800 vacancies there. Can you imagine the biggest life insurance company in the world that would ever accept an amendment like this? It is a monstrosity; it cannot work. They are going to have 3,800 vacancies, and when these people in your State and every other State of the Union are not getting their checks, we can point out who the author of this amendment was and who voted for it.

There is another thing I want to cover. The gentleman told me the other day that the General Accounting Office practically wrote this amendment for him, or a year ago, anyway.

Mr. JENSEN. No; I did not just say that.

Mr. FOGARTY. I mean, that helped the gentleman write it.

Mr. JENSEN. They worked with me 2 weeks to make sure that we had a good amendment that would apply fairly and properly to every agency of the Government.

Mr. FOGARTY. Let me tell you what they had to say before the Senate last year, after the gentleman's amendment was adopted.

Mr. JENSEN. What did Mr. Lindsay Warren say differently just the other day?

Mr. FOGARTY. I have not seen these hearings before.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman read everything he said?

Mr. FOGARTY. They have not been up before a congressional committee yet.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman will not pick out a paragraph and read it, will he?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; I am referring to the amendment, and then what they had to say about it. Mr. Weitzel appeared before the Committee on Appropriations in 1951, and Mr. Yates was there also. Mr. Weitzel said:

Mr. Chairman, I think you will recall my prefacing my statement on chapter X-A, that we in the General Accounting Office still feel—

That is your baby now, the General Accounting Office.

Mr. JENSEN. O. K.

Mr. FOGARTY. Continuing—

that we in the General Accounting Office still feel that the best way to cut the appropriations is for the committee—

That is you and me and every other member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JENSEN. But we did not do it.

Mr. FOGARTY. Continuing, Mr. Weitzel said—

to examine the individual appropriations and make the cuts where they think the cuts can be made.

Now, that is your responsibility, and that is mine, and that is the responsibility of the House. That is the General Accounting Office speaking.

Let me go further. They say:

To apply it, however, in a measure which will not be enacted until after the beginning of the new fiscal year—

That pertains to 1952 that I am talking about now—

as section 1114 would do, abruptly, immediately, with respect to one fiscal year would so obviously, it seems to me, make operations extremely difficult, if not impossible, in some agencies where the turn-over is great.

That is exactly what you are doing here today and that is exactly what every one of you will do when you vote for this amendment this afternoon. You are going to put some of these agencies in a strait-jacket. We have the responsibility to determine how much personnel they shall operate with. It is the administrative responsibility of the men and women we are paying down there to run these agencies efficiently. That is what we want. But you are not going to get efficiency out of this operation. It is going to be a more costly operation, and the men who helped the gentleman write this amendment so state.

Mr. JENSEN. No; now, wait. The gentleman is making a lot of statements that cannot be borne out by the facts. Those gentlemen did not help me write the amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Did Mr. Yates help the gentleman on this amendment?

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is making a lot of wild statements.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Yates said:

If I may add, Mr. Chairman, difficult and expensive to apply administratively.

That is the author of the gentleman's amendment who said that, yet the gentleman is coming up here this afternoon and saying, "We are going to save \$1,000,000,000." The gentleman has no

more idea than I do how much it is going to save.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, I have.

Mr. FOGARTY. Or how much additional it is going to cost the Federal Government to operate in the next fiscal year.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island does not bring out the fact that if any of these bureaus do find themselves in difficulty this coming spring they can come before the Subcommittee on Appropriations affected and state their case. We can then put them under that particular class of exemptions, if we so wish. I think we will be very foolish if we do not adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Iowa has any further statements to make at this time, I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. JENSEN. In the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill and also in this bill we exempt the charwomen and the elevator boys, because they come under that first and second CPC provision.

Another thing, we protect the agencies that have a big turn-over by the provision which we inserted in this amendment that when the agency has been reduced to the amount of 20 percent this amendment shall not operate.

Further, since the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] had such a good time on the floor and said, "Why did not we do it in committee?" may I say there is one good reason why. It is because it happens that there were only two Republicans on that committee, and five Democrats. With all honor to the Democrats, and all of them are fine gentlemen who try to do a good job in their way of doing things, what chance have two got against five? We tried, but we could not do it. So we have to do the job that is left undone in committee and try to do it on the floor. May I ask the gentleman from Minnesota if that is not correct?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is absolutely correct. It is unfortunate that we must do on the floor here the job that should be done in committee, but because of certain circumstances it is impossible of being done in that committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman referred to a deficiency appropriation. I assume from that the gentleman from Minnesota favors deficiency appropriations?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Minnesota said nothing whatsoever about deficiency appropriations. He said that if any division or bureau of the Government found itself in difficulties it could come before our Committee on Appropriations and state its case and prove it. In that case certainly, I assume, the Committee on Ap-

propriations would do what is right by that bureau.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I refuse to yield further.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, may I say to the majority leader that the Republicans of the Eightieth Congress proved by their actions that they favored deficiencies. I sat on the deficiency appropriations, and in the Eighty-first Congress practically every agency of the Government came before us with a request for a deficiency appropriation to cover the cut that they received in the Eightieth Congress as a result of which cut they could not continue their operations.

Further than that, I want to say something about committees. I think most people in this Chamber will recognize I have had some experience in appropriations and on committees. I regard the explanation that occurred here a few minutes ago about this amendment, as using a cap gun in the committee and a blunderbuss on the floor. They just pull the trigger and shoot everything in sight and do it for the purpose of making a big hit—a big hit with a blunderbuss, but they forget the reaction. They are grabbing every coatrack that comes along to hang their hat on, only to discover that the racks are not securely fastened to the wall and are falling one after another. So it is with their issues. A month ago they blew up a fur coat all out of proportion to the problem involved to a point where everybody in the country thought we owned one. Then it was something else; one committee investigation or another, then the difficulties in Korea, and now we have one Member of the Congress who has so expressed himself as to shake the confidence of the Nation in the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the detriment and the heartache of every mother in this country. I understand, and on pretty good authority, that we are to have roll-call votes here when this playing around with an appropriation bill is finished. There was a time when we did not play politics with appropriations in this Nation. We had some respect, at least, for proper spending to safeguard necessary projects. But I am sorry to confess to the Nation from the floor of Congress that that day has gone. I bid the people of the west to check the roll calls that are to be made in this House in regard to this bill. I bid them to look at the Democratic support that they will receive from the North and the East and from some Members of the South. I beg them to look at it, and I beg them to realize that we as a party are considering the Nation as a complete fabric and that we recognize the danger of having a weakness in any thread for we want our country to be strong for our national defense and desire to do those things for the West that are beneficial to the people of that area. Yes, look at these roll calls, people of the West, I ask you to look at them. I ask you to survey them. I ask you to study

them. Then you will realize who it is that seeks to carry this country to the pinnacle which it deserves, as the great Nation that it is, for the benefit of its own preservation and its devotion to mankind.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I have had the pleasure of serving on the subcommittee with the gentleman from Iowa for a number of years. I do not know of anybody who is more conscientious in his desire to save Federal money than the gentleman from Iowa, BEN JENSEN, and I say that indeed with no offense. I have given some attention to this matter of personnel. I was the author of the amendment last year which applies throughout the Government which limited the total number of permanent personnel to that existing on September 1, 1950. It provides further that anybody who transfers must come back to the agency from which he transferred at the rate at which he left. The absence of such provisions during the war led to the upgrading in the average Government department of an average of two grades, resulting in the present expenditure of over a billion dollars a year.

It is estimated that my amendment will save an average of around half a billion dollars a year.

The pending amendment I do not believe will save money. While I agree with the gentleman's purpose and his intentions and I can see how many of you have supported it as a protest against the number of Federal Government employees, I do not think it will work. The amendment provides that not more than 25 percent of the vacancies that may arise during the next fiscal year can be filled. One agency may have 10 times as many vacancies as another. Would this amendment give to each fair treatment? Practically every department and agency has a number of unfilled positions; what is to keep them from not employing somebody to one of the presently unfilled positions that they now have? What is to prevent them from doing that? The vacancies may be kept vacant in the lower grades, the service end of an agency, while those filled may be all supervisory personnel. If they should do that what will happen could be that you retain all supervisory personnel but have no people in the field to do the work. One of our problems in Government is too many areas of supervision and too few people doing field work. One of the other problems is to try to keep agencies from increasing the level of salaries of employees across the Government by increasing grades.

Let me point out some other things. I realize and understand there will be a roll call vote on this amendment. I have done a good deal of work and studied this question in connection with the rider which I offered last year and which is now the law and I will say that we are busy now trying to perfect an amend-

ment on a sound basis to hold stable the present salary levels and to continue to limit the total number of permanent personnel. We are busy on that. Now, I do think that this is something to which we should give our attention, and goodness knows I have put lots of work and study on this problem even though it does not happen to come before my subcommittee.

As to my sincerity on this matter, I may state that my subcommittee is going to bring in the Agricultural bill in a few days, and we have been working on this problem. Let me point out that the rolls of the Department of Agriculture since 1941 have been reduced from 108,000 to much below 65,000. You can do it in the Committee; and I say that is the way to do it, and we are going to bring in a provision which will effect these reductions. If you want to reduce the personnel, do it, but I do not think you will do it with an amendment of this kind. There are too many weaknesses in it. I do not believe this amendment will work. For that reason I am opposing it, and in doing that I want to say that I commend the gentleman from Iowa for the utmost sincerity and for his views, but I feel that I do have an obligation to the House to point out the things that I think would prevent this amendment from bringing about what he seeks.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. This method has worked very successfully in the General Accounting Office, and it worked very successfully during the depression in most of the State governments and in every municipality of any size and in a lot of counties. They talk about paper work; surely it is worth a little to save a billion dollars.

Mr. WHITTEN. There are two ways to limit personnel: One, limit the money; the other, limit the people, and in both instances you must retain the existing average salary levels. That is the straightforward, fair way to do it and not by an amendment such as we have before us in this instance; for under it one agency of the Government might not be hurt, because it could have all the people it needs, but another might be hamstrung.

Mr. JENSEN. Did the gentleman know that I had another provision in this amendment which states that when any agency reduces its personnel to the degree of 20 percent that the amendment will not hold?

Mr. WHITTEN. I will say to the gentleman that I think that is a step in the right direction, but it also admits the weakness of the amendment adopted last week.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. I want to say in all sincerity that I do not believe there is a Member of this House who has done more for the economy of the country than the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. I think he has given a very logical reason for voting against this amendment. He has been working on this for years while on the Appropriations Committee. I want to say that I agree with him 100 percent. It is not fair to every agency. There are many agencies which have more vacancies than others, and you are not being fair with them.

It also, I believe, will create and encourage inefficiency; because it will encourage some of the agency heads to hold on to inefficient help. That is what you will see if you adopt this amendment. It is also going to do as the gentleman from Mississippi has said, it is going to mean the pirating of labor from one department to another. It will make for unstable conditions instead of the stability we need in every agency in this country.

Mr. WHITTEN. I know of one agency in Government that is not using all the money it had. They have not filled existing vacancies and therefore they do not plan to use all of the money for present year. The head of this agency is a good administrator, but if this amendment applies to his agency he can protect himself against its future operation by filling all these unfilled positions before the 1st of July, so that in the next year he will not be caught under this provision and be unable to do his work. That is from a man who is turning back money to the Treasury.

I am not criticizing anyone who may differ with me. In all frankness, in my judgment, there is one basis only upon which a vote for this amendment might be justified and that would be as a protest against the size of Government rolls, but just as a protest for something that is unworkable is not sufficient reason to me. Instead of just protesting I think we should do something about the problem and on this I believe I have done something about it, and assure you I will continue to try to do something about it.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be allotted to the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I have supported this pending amendment before and I am going to support it

again. It has been here in slightly different form several times. It has received substantial support from the membership of the House of Representatives and I think it ought to have this support.

What are the plain facts about the matter? The people of the country know, and we, collectively and individually know, that we have more people on the Federal payroll than we need. The people of the country are demanding that we do something about it and certainly in a time like this when people all over the country are being asked to go under a program of austerity, cutting down on their manpower requirements, cutting off here and cutting off there, the Government and the agencies of the Government should be the first to set the example.

What sort of an operation is it under which the people in the country are to be asked to forego many of the things they would like to have but that employment as usual, spending as usual, must go in the actions of the Federal Government?

It has been said here, two, three or four times that "We are going to have roll calls on these amendments." You are not scaring any of us. I shall be very happy to take my stand with those Members of this body who have the courage to get up here and vote to cut some of these Federal appropriations. Let me say to any of you Members who think you are going to curry favor at this place or that place by voting against these cuts that you may wake up one fine day to find out that the American people have moved 'way beyond you, and that instead of wanting you to shovel out the taxpayers' money to pay for people you do not need on the Federal payroll they are going to say: "You'd better stay at home. We will send somebody down there with courage enough to put a little economy in the Government."

I know that every time you get ready to separate someone from the Federal payroll the folks who want to keep them all on there can find a thousand reasons why you cannot get rid of one. In whatever course of action you undertake in carrying out the philosophy of getting rid of some people on the Federal payroll, those Members who want to keep these bloated payrolls going in perpetuity can find this little thing that is wrong with the program or that little thing that is wrong with the program. As far as I am concerned I am not going to look for that minor thing here and there that may be subject to a little criticism. I am going to look at the over-all necessities of the situation and I am going to vote accordingly. That is the reason I shall support the Jensen amendment.

Let me say again, if you do not support it then you are putting yourself right smack in the crowd that just wants to keep the Federal payrolls as big as they possibly can be.

The gentleman from Michigan spoke about our playing around with an appropriation bill. Well, if to come in here and save millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money is playing around, there,

again, I am mighty glad to plead guilty to playing around. In my opinion, it is not playing around. It has to do with the very fabric, fiber, and existence of this Nation. There is no higher responsibility resting on the House of Representatives as we consider these appropriation bills than the one which demands of us that we put our financial house in order. Oh, I realize that when he said he wants the people of certain areas to look at how the Democrats of the North and East and the South are going to vote on this amendment he wants them to check the record. Well, apparently he believes that the votes of the people of America are for sale on the auction block of Federal expenditures and payrolls. If he wants to believe that, let him believe it but, as far as I am concerned, I refuse to believe it, and I am glad that he has seen fit to drag the evil thing right out here by its ears for all to see.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted me be yielded to the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. I again say I shall be happy to have the roll called and to see how some of you folks vote who put nice speeches in the papers back home telling your folks you are for economy in Government. You go back home and make speeches to that effect. You say, "Oh, yes, there are too many people on the Federal payroll. I know that we can get along without them down in Washington just as you do get along without people at home." You make those fine statements and those great speeches, but the test comes now on how you are going to vote.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Not at the moment. After I have completed my statement, I will.

Mr. RABAUT. I think the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. I never made such a statement in my district in my life.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, then, I am glad to accept the gentleman's correction. Let me add only that he should have been making them back there and he should be carrying them out right here. The gentleman from Michigan also talked about Korea. He brought that in. Well, I do not know whether he has read the Wedemeyer report or not. I have been reading it, and with much interest; a great general, a great military man, commissioned back in 1947 to investigate that situation. He came back with a report that was so prophetic that as of today, as I read it, I marvel at the sagacity and the wisdom and the powers of observation that gave him and those who worked with him the insight into what was going to happen. If the Wedemeyer report had not been suppressed by the political branch of

the Government, the people of this country would have been so aroused that our military forces would not have been pulled out of Korea and that area of Asia abandoned. We would not have had Korea, may I say to the gentleman from Michigan. He brought it up; I did not bring it up, and what it had to do with this particular debate, I do not know. But, if he wanted to bring it up, as far as I am concerned, I am ready to meet it head on. I only wish that the Wedemeyer report had not been suppressed, because then the people of this country would have known and we would not be in this situation today. I might even express the hope that General Wedemeyer would have found it in his heart and his conscience and his mind to have spoken out to the American people about what he found out even though the power of suppression was exerted against him.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be yielded to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has made reference to the reduction in the personnel of the General Accounting Office, and with all due respect to my friend, Lindsay Warren, whom I admire very much, and who is one of my close, valued friends, I think the facts will show that some of that reduction came about principally by reason of the cessation of the work in connection with the renegotiation of contracts. My friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] referred to the fact that they could come up for a deficiency appropriation. Of course, when I asked him the question whether he favored deficiency appropriations, he realized the position he had placed himself in and naturally tried to remove himself from it.

I wanted to make one additional observation at that time, but the gentleman from Minnesota hastily manifested his disturbed frame of mind when he said he would not yield any more. I wanted to make the observation that if they did come up they faced the antideficiency law, which carries with it the possibility of indictment and, upon conviction, jail.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, but let me finish first. The gentleman from Minnesota thoughtlessly overlooked that important law.

I now yield for a question.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman was entirely incorrect when he stated that the gentleman from Minnesota had made any—

Mr. McCORMACK. I will take the gentleman's word. Will the gentleman read the RECORD? He will not correct the RECORD, will he?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I will leave it exactly as it is. I will challenge the gentleman to get the Clerk to read that RECORD here.

Mr. McCORMACK. Never mind the challenge. Let the gentleman make no corrections and I will make no corrections.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. All right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then we will let the Members draw their own interpretation.

This is one of the most important bills that has come before the Congress, for at least a dozen States of the Union. My dear friend from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], who is one of the Republican leaders, and those who interpret his remarks must keep in mind that he is one of the leaders of the Republican Party in Congress and that he spoke for his party, made some remarks in which he said, "They are not scaring any of us." There are millions of people in those 12 States who are interested in those projects. Those are near and dear to their hopes and aspirations. The concern their future economic outlook. They concern the development of their States and that great section of the country that sends many Members to this body elected as Republicans. I wonder how they are going to feel when they read the RECORD, or if most of the press, which is Republican, gives a fair coverage of the news of the debate today, when they read that the Republican leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], said to those millions of people, "None of you were scaring any of us."

These roll calls are justifiable. I hope there will be a roll call asked on every matter of concern to the people involved in the States that are affected by the cut.

The gentleman from Indiana said the American people "have moved beyond us." I do not know what he meant by that statement, but certainly the people have moved far beyond the Republican leadership in Congress. That has been evident by the election and reelection of the Democratic Party during the past 20 years. There is one thing we Democrats can always rely upon, we can rely upon the Republican leadership in Congress making mistakes. When the gentleman from Indiana cast that aspersion, which it is, upon the people of 12 States of the Union, at least, when he says, "None of them are scaring any of us," I think they are justified in expressing their resentment at the proper time.

I wonder how they feel when they realize that what the gentleman said is that they are coming in here seeking a grab bag in connection with projects that they think are vital to the best interests of their States and their section.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] made a contribution to the debate when he stated that the people of the States affected should look at the roll calls and see the large percentage of Democrats, north, east, south, and west, who will be voting for their interests, and then compare it with the vote of the members of the Republican Party. They

will probably find every few Republicans from the East and the North and the Middle East voting for their interests, but as they look the roll calls over they will find Democrats from those sections voting for their interests, because we view these problems from the national angle, not purely from a sectional angle. The necessary improvement of any section of the country or of any State of the Union inures to the national interest of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JENSEN and Mr. JACKSON of Washington.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 168, noes 146.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

This act may be cited as the "Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1952."

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending bill and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have not spoken on the bill during the 7 or 8 days it has been considered.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I want to be fair; I modify my request and ask that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does that mean 5 minutes for each gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has already been recognized. The time will be divided three ways.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I will take 5 minutes then, and give it to the gentleman from Nebraska.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has been recognized for 5 minutes already.

If the gentleman from Washington would modify his request to read that all debate on the pending bill close in 10 minutes, five having been allotted to the gentleman from California and five to the gentleman from Nebraska, I think it might possibly be agreed to.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is satisfactory.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does that mean there is only 5 minutes for the gentleman from Nebraska and the gentleman from Washington?

The CHAIRMAN. Five minutes each.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington that all debate on the pending bill close in 10 minutes, the time to be allotted as indicated?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, late yesterday afternoon this House after due consideration passed an amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] providing in effect that power facilities should not be built by the Bureau of Reclamation whenever there was in existence a contract providing that private industry would wheel that power in the areas where the lines are to be built to preferred customers and Government establishments. That amendment passed.

Sometime during the night a memorandum was prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation attacking that amendment and seeking to influence the passage of the amendment by the House. This morning a gentleman by the name of Mr. Johnson, from the Bureau, took it upon himself to go among the Members of this House to circulate what purported to be the interpretation of the amendment in an effort to defeat it.

Perhaps the gentleman of the Bureau did not know what section 201, title 18 of the United States Code provides; therefore, in the hope that they will read this Record I am going to read it:

No part of the money appropriated by any act shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers and employees of the United States from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

Any officer or employee of the United States who, after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, is found to have violated or attempted to violate this section, shall be removed by such superior officer from office or employment. Any officer or employee of the United States who violates or attempts to violate this section shall also be guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$500 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday afternoon I pointed out to the committee that there were still lines in this bill which the Keating amendment removed that were admitted by the Bureau of Reclamation at the committee hearings not to be necessary if a wheeling agreement were entered into in California. I pointed out to this committee that this agreement was entered into on April 2 after the Bureau of the Budget had made its requests and after the committee had closed its hearings.

The leaflet they put out this morning is a statement of half-truths and half-facts leaving false inferences. They were prepared for the purpose of propagandizing Members of various States.

The one for California is unsigned and reads as follows:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, FISCAL YEAR 1952,
PROGRAM OF TRANSMISSION FACILITIES

It is understood that the following amendment was offered by Congressman KEATING of New York:

"On page 16, line 3, strike out the period at the end of the sentence and add 'Provided, no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by existing wheeling construction which make provision for supplying Federal installations and preference customers.'"

The meaning of this amendment is not entirely clear, but a literal interpretation would appear to prohibit the construction of any transmission facilities upon which

actual construction had not started in the field prior to July 1, 1951. This would mean that, although a contractor under a labor-and-material type of contract might have ordered all of the necessary materials, delivery of which had not been received, he could not start construction when materials were delivered; also, it would mean that substations for which equipment has been on order for many months but delivery is not due until after July 1, 1951, could also not be placed in construction. In some cases this will result in transmission lines having been completed, but substation facilities could not be added to make the lines already constructed of any use.

The attached tabulations indicate by States the probable effect on construction of transmission facilities by the proposed amendment:

CALIFORNIA

Project and feature	Budget estimate	Effect of Keating amendment
Central Valley project.....	\$5,556,478	
Shasta-Tracy transmission line (West Side No. 1 and No. 2) (230-kilovolt).....	200,000	Not affected.
Keswick-Tracy via Elverta transmission line (115-kilovolt).....	1,400,000	Eliminated by committee report.
Keswick-SDAPUD transmission line and substation (115-kilovolt) (13.8-kilovolt).....	105,308	Construction prohibited.
Folsom-Elverta-Sacto-Folsom loop and substation (115-kilovolt).....	500,000	Do.
Port Chicago-Mare Island transmission line and substation (115-kilovolt).....	300,000	Eliminated by committee report.
Tracy-Livermore-Ames transmission line and substation (115-kilovolt).....	700,000	Construction prohibited.
Tracy-C. C.-Clayton-Ignacio transmission line and substation (69-kilovolt).....	201,170	Do.
Tracy-Patterson-Naval supply transmission line and substation (69-kilovolt).....	450,000	Eliminated by committee report.
CVP-BPA interconnection and substation (230-kilovolt).....	1,700,000	Do.
Total, California.....	5,556,478	

I point out this matter so that the committee can take upon itself the duty of investigating these illegal activities which have been going on last night and this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

(Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, this bill that has been debated vigorously and intelligently, sometimes spiritedly, the last 6 days does affect my district and the 17 Western States. I have been concerned at times about some of the cuts that have been made. I am going to go along with reasonable cuts in the bill. Some of the cuts affect my district but my people want economy. I will go along with the so-called Jensen amendment because I know that Government agencies duplicate their work on many surveys. They do that in my State. I have quarrelled with them about that. We had the Reclamation Bureau, the Geodetic Survey, the Army Engineers, Fish and Wildlife all making some surveys, which, of course, are necessary, but it does seem one agency could have made the survey, then we would save some of the taxpayers' money.

I am sorry that the majority leader has seen fit to inject politics into this bill. There should not be any politics. After all, we are all interested in developing the resources of the West. It is not a political issue and his threat to make it so is unfortunate.

I want to ask the committee, especially the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] because he offered an amendment yesterday that would take some \$10,000,000 out of the bill, the amendment reading:

Page 16, line 2, strike out "\$207,190,000" and insert "\$197,000,000" and the cut below the budget estimate shall be deducted from the estimates for power and transmission lines.

This was later amended by an amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE] which strikes out that portion of the Taber amendment reading: "and the cut below the budget estimate shall be deducted from the estimates for power and transmission lines."

I understand from the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE] it was his intention that the cut should be made across the board and not be taken from any particular project. I want to ask the gentleman if that was his intention?

Mr. LOVRE. The gentleman is entirely correct and I should like to refer him to my remarks made yesterday appearing at page 4742 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I said:

I sincerely hope you will support this amendment which cuts the same amount as the Taber amendment—the only difference being that it spreads the cut over the entire program without scuttling the many essential projects now under construction in approximately a dozen States.

That was definitely my intention.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York if that was his thought?

Mr. TABER. I accepted the Lovre amendment. My thought was that the cut should be taken first out of such things as were eliminated later by the Congress, such things as would be cut out by the Keating amendment, and then it would be distributed pro rata according to amount allowed among the projects that were approved by the committee appearing on pages 9 and 10 of its report.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That would amount to about a 5-percent cut in the reclamation part of the bill?

Mr. TABER. About 4 percent.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. About 4 percent. With that understanding I will go with reluctance along with those amendments.

I do feel, Mr. Chairman, that in the development of the 17 western States, which includes the major resources of this country, we should not cut these appropriation bills to a point where progress will not proceed because those are the great resources we have. They must be developed to meet expanding needs of a growing population. If no war was going on, I would resist these several cuts and beg for more irrigation projects. More for surveys, soil conservation. And worthy projects.

I also would point out to you that we are spending large amounts of money for foreign aid programs. I understand we are spending more money to develop irrigation and public work projects in other parts of the world than we are spending for irrigation in our own country. We should develop our own resources first in order that we may stay strong. New irrigation projects produce new wealth and add food to the growing needs of the world. They bring in added taxes. They must be developed.

Mr. Chairman, with the understanding that the cut here of some \$10,000,000 is to be spread across the board and not taken out of any one project, I am reluctantly going along with the cut. I must warn my colleagues that the time has arrived that we must give some attention to the development of our vast resources yet undeveloped. When this war is over we must speed the development of our natural resources.

(Mr. WERDEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry

amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment on page 2, beginning at line 7, the so-called Gary amendment to the Southeastern Power Administration.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment on page 4, line 1, the so-called Harris amendment to the Southwestern Power Administration.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment on page 5, line 16, the so-called Ford amendment to the Bonneville Power Administration.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on page 6, beginning on line 25, on the so-called Pickett amendment to the Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment on page 15, beginning on line 10, known as the Wigglesworth amendment to the Bureau of Reclamation investigative funds.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment beginning on page 16, line 2, known as the Taber amendment to the Bureau of Reclamation construction fund.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment beginning on page 16, line 3, known as the Keating amendment to the Bureau of Reclamation with reference to wheeling contracts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment on page 42, beginning on line 21, known as the Jensen amendment relative to filling vacancies.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment on page 4, line 3, known as the Short amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The other amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 7 through 13, inclusive.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 248, nays 149, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 39]

YEAS—248

Aandahl
Abernethy
Adair
Allen, Ill.

Allen, La.
Andersen,
H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.

Andresen,
August H.
Andrews
Arends

Armstrong
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Bakewell
Barden
Bates, Ky.
Bates, Mass.
Battle
Beall
Beamer
Belcher
Bender
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentsen
Berry
Betts
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Boggs, La.
Bolton
Bow
Boykin
Bray
Brehm
Brown, Ohio
Bryson
Budge
Buffett
Burleson
Burnside
Burton
Busbey
Bush
Butler
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Carlyle
Case
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Colmer
Cooley
Corbett
Cotton
Cox
Crawford
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Nebr.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Deane
DeGraffenried
Denny
Devereux
D'Ewart
Dolliver
Dondero
Donohue
Donovan
Durham
Eaton
Ellsworth
Elston
Fallon
Fellows
Fenton
Fisher
Ford
Forrester
Fugate
Fulton
Gamble
Gary
Gathings

Gavin
George
Golden
Goodwin
Gossett
Graham
Grant
Greenwood
Gross
Gwinn
Hale
Hall,
Edwin Arthur
Hall,
Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harrison, Wyo.
Harvey
Hays, Ark.
Hedrick
Herlong
Herter
Heslton
Hess
Hill
Hillings
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Hope
Hunter
James
Jarman
Jenison
Jenkins
Jensen
Jonas
Jones,
Hamilton C.
Jones,
Woodrow W.
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kennedy
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilday
Lantaff
Latham
LeCompte
Lovre
Lucas
Lyle
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGrath
McGregor
McMillan
McMullen
McVey
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Morrow
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Morano
Morton
Mumma
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
Norrell

O'Hara
Ostertag
Passman
Patten
Patterson
Philbin
Pickett
Polk
Potter
Poulson
Prouty
Radwan
Reams
Reed, Ill.
Rees, Kans.
Regan
Ribicoff
Richards
Riehlman
Roberts
Robeson
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Sadlak
St. George
Sasser
Saylor
Schwabe
Scott, Hardie
Scott,
Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Scudder
Secret
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sheehan
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sittler
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stanley
Stefan
Taber
Tackett
Talle
Taylor
Teague
Thompson,
Mich.
Towe
Vail
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Walter
Welchel
Werdel
Wharton
Wheeler
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood, Ga.
Wood, Idaho

NAYS—149

Abbitt
Addonizio
Albert
Allen, Calif.
Anfuso
Angell
Aspinall
Bailey
Baring
Barrett
Beckworth
Blatnik
Bolling
Bonner
Bosone
Breen
Brown, Ga.
Buckley
Burdick
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp

Cannon
Carnahan
Celler
Chelf
Chudoff
Clemente
Combs
Cooper
Crosser
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
Dollinger
Dorn
Doughton
Doyle
Eberharter
Engle
Evins

Feighan
Fernandez
Fine
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Frazier
Furcolo
Garmatz
Gordon
Granahan
Granger
Green
Gregory
Hagen
Hart
Havenner
Hays, Ohio
Heffernan
Heller
Holmes

Horan	Miller, Calif.	Rodino	Andresen	Fulton	Nelson	Karsten, Mo.	Multer	Roosevelt
Howell	Mills	Rogers, Colo.	August H.	Gamble	Nicholson	Kelly, N. Y.	Murdoch	Sabath
Hull	Mitchell	Rooney	Andrews	Gary	Norblad	Keogh	Murphy	Sasser
Jackson, Wash.	Morgan	Roosevelt	Arends	Garvin	Norrell	Kerr	O'Brien, Ill.	Secrest
Javits	Morris	Sabath	Armstrong	George	O'Hara	Kilday	O'Brien, Mich.	Shelley
Johnson	Morrison	Shelley	Auchincloss	Golden	Ostertag	Kirwan	O'Konski	Sheppard
Jones, Ala.	Moulder	Sheppard	Ayres	Goodwin	Passman	Kluczynski	O'Neill	Sieminski
Jones, Mo.	Multer	Sieminski	Baker	Graham	Patterson	Lane	O'Toole	Smith, Miss.
Karsten, Mo.	Murdoch	Spence	Bakewell	Greenwood	Philbin	Lanham	Patman	Spence
Kelly, N. Y.	Murphy	Staggers	Barden	Gross	Phillips	Lesinski	Patten	Staggers
Kerr	O'Brien, Ill.	Steed	Battle	Gwinn	Pickett	Lind	Perkins	Steed
King	O'Brien, Mich.	Stigler	Beall	Hale	Potter	Lucas	Poage	Stigler
Kirwan	O'Konski	Stockman	Beamer	Hall	Poulson	Lyle	Polk	Stockman
Kluczynski	O'Neill	Sutton	Belcher	Edwin Arthur	Prouty	McCarthy	Preston	Sutton
Lane	O'Toole	Thomas	Bender	Hall	Radwan	McCormack	Price	Thomas
Lanham	Patman	Thompson, Tex.	Bennett, Fla.	Leonard W.	Reed, Ill.	McGuire	Priest	Thompson, Tex.
Lesinski	Perkins	Thornberry	Bennett, Mich.	Halleck	Rees, Kans.	McKinnon	Quinn	Thornberry
Lind	Phillips	Tollefson	Berry	Hand	Ribicoff	Machrowicz	Rabaut	Tollefson
McCarthy	Poage	Trimble	Betts	Harden	Riehlman	Mack, Ill.	Ramsay	Trimble
McCormack	Preston	Vinson	Bishop	Hardy	Robeson	Mack, Wash.	Rankin	Vinson
McGuire	Price	Welch	Blackney	Harris	Rogers, Fla.	Madden	Reams	Walter
McKinnon	Priest	Whitten	Boggs, Del.	Harrison, Va.	Rogers, Mass.	Magee	Reece, Tenn.	Welch
Machrowicz	Quinn	Whitsham	Boggs, La.	Harrison, Wyo.	Sadlak	Mahon	Regan	Wickersham
Mack, Ill.	Rabaut	Wier	Bolton	Harvey	St. George	Marshall	Rhodes	Wier
Mack, Wash.	Ramsay	Withrow	Bow	Hedrick	Saylor	Miller, Calif.	Richards	Willis
Madden	Rankin	Yates	Boykin	Herlong	Schwabe	Mills	Riley	Wilson, Tex.
Magee	Reece, Tenn.	Yorby	Bray	Herter	Scott, Hardie	Mitchell	Roberts	Withrow
Mahon	Rhodes	Zablocki	Brehm	Heseltun	Scott,	Morgan	Rodino	Yates
Marshall	Riley		Brown, Ohio	Hess	Hugh D., Jr.	Morris	Rogers, Colo.	Yorby
			Brownson	Hill	Scrivner	Morrison	Rogers, Tex.	Zablocki
			Bryson	Hillings	Scudder	Moulder	Rooney	
			Budge	Hoever	Seely-Brown			
			Buffett	Hoffman, Ill.	Shafer			
			Burnside	Hoffman, Mich.	Sheehan			
			Burton	Hope	Short			
			Busbey	Hunter	Sikes			
			Bush	James	Simpson, Ill.			
			Butler	Jenison	Simpson, Pa.			
			Byrnes, Wis.	Jenkins	Sittler			
			Canfield	Jensen	Smith, Kans.			
			Carlyle	Jonas	Smith, Va.			
			Case	Jones	Smith, Wis.			
			Chenoweth	Hamilton C.	Springer			
			Chilperfield	Jones	Stanley			
			Church	Woodrow W.	Stefan			
			Clevenger	Judd	Taber			
			Cole, Kans.	Kean	Tackett			
			Colmer	Kearney	Talle			
			Corbett	Kearns	Taylor			
			Cotton	Keating	Teague			
			Crawford	Kilburn	Thompson,			
			Crumpacker	Lantaff	Mich.			
			Cunningham	Latham	Towe			
			Curtis, Nebr.	LeCompte	Vail			
			Dague	Love	Van Pelt			
			Davis, Ga.	McConnell	Van Zandt			
			Davis, Wis.	McCulloch	Velde			
			Denny	McDonough	Vors			
			Devereux	McGrath	Vursell			
			D'Ewart	McGregor	Weichel			
			Dondero	McMillan	Werdel			
			Donohue	McMullen	Wharton			
			Donovan	McVey	Wheeler			
			Doughton	Martin, Iowa	Whitten			
			Durham	Martin, Mass.	Wigglesworth			
			Eaton	Mason	Williams, Miss.			
			Ellsworth	Meador	Williams, N. Y.			
			Elston	Merrrow	Wilson, Ind.			
			Fallon	Miller, Md.	Winstead			
			Fellows	Miller, Nebr.	Wolcott			
			Fenton	Miller, N. Y.	Wolverton			
			Ford	Morano	Wood, Ga.			
			Forrester	Morton	Wood, Idaho			
			Fugate	Mumma				

NOT VOTING—36

Bramblett	Hébert	Murray, Tenn.
Brooks	Hinshaw	Murray, Wis.
Brownson	Hollifield	Powell
Chatham	Irving	Rains
Cole, N. Y.	Jackson, Calif.	Redden
Coudert	Kee	Reed, N. Y.
Curtis, Mo.	Kelley, Pa.	Rivers
Dingell	Kersten, Wis.	Vaughn
Elliott	Klein	Watts
Gillette	Larcade	Whitaker
Gore	Mansfield	Widnall
Harden	Meador	Woodruff

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Brownson for, with Mr. Klein against.
 Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Whitaker against.
 Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Powell against.
 Mrs. Harden for, with Mr. Mansfield against.
 Mr. Meador for, with Mr. Dingell against.
 Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Redden against.
 Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.
 Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Irving against.
 Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Hollifield against.
 Mr. Vaughn for, with Mr. Kee against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Cole of New York.
 Mr. Larcade with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Murray of Tennessee with Mr. Woodruff.
 Mr. Rivers with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
 Mr. Elliott with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Gore with Mr. Widnall.
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Reed of New York.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 1, after the comma, strike out "\$3,925,000" and insert "\$3,375,000."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 222, nays 173, answered "present" 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—222

Aandahl	Allen, Calif.	Andersen,
Abernethy	Allen, Ill.	H. Carl
Adair	Allen, La.	Anderson, Calif.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Cox

NAYS—173

Abbott	Chudoff	Furcolo
Addonizio	Clemente	Garmatz
Albert	Combs	Gathings
Anfuso	Cooley	Gordon
Angell	Cooper	Gossett
Aspinall	Crosser	Granahan
Bailey	Davis, Tenn.	Granger
Baring	Dawson	Grant
Barrett	Deane	Green
Bates, Ky.	DeGraffenried	Gregory
Beckworth	Delaney	Hagen
Bentzen	Dempsey	Hart
Blatnik	Denton	Havenner
Bolling	Dollinger	Hays, Ark.
Bonner	Dorn	Hays, Ohio
Bosone	Doyle	Heffernan
Breen	Eberharter	Heller
Brown, Ga.	Engle	Holmes
Buckley	Evins	Horan
Burdick	Feighan	Howell
Burleson	Fernandez	Hull
Byrne, N. Y.	Fine	Jackson, Wash.
Camp	Fisher	Jarman
Cannon	Flood	Javits
Carnahan	Fogarty	Johnson
Celler	Forand	Jones, Ala.
Chelf	Frazier	Jones, Mo.

NOT VOTING—38

Bates, Mass.	Hinshaw	Murray, Wis.
Bramblett	Hollifield	Powell
Brooks	Irving	Rains
Chatham	Jackson, Calif.	Redden
Cole, N. Y.	Kee	Reed, N. Y.
Coudert	Kelley, Pa.	Rivers
Curtis, Mo.	Kennedy	Vaughn
Dingell	Kersten, Wis.	Watts
Dolliver	King	Whitaker
Elliott	Klein	Widnall
Gillette	Larcade	Woodruff
Gore	Mansfield	
Hébert	Murray, Tenn.	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Klein against.
 Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Whitaker against.
 Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Hollifield against.
 Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Mansfield against.
 Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Dingell against.
 Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Redden against.
 Mr. Vaughn for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.
 Mr. Brooks for, with Mr. Irving against.
 Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Kee against.
 Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. King against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Larcade with Mr. Widnall.
 Mr. Elliott with Mr. Woodruff.
 Mr. Murray of Tennessee with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Gore with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. SASSCER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 3, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That this appropriation shall not be expended for the construction of facilities designated as comprising the western Missouri project."

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, is it in order to ask for a roll call on an amendment that passed unanimously and was accepted by the chairman of the subcommittee?

The SPEAKER. That makes no difference whatever. The gentleman has been here a long time.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 247, nays 152, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

YEAS—247

Aandahl	Fisher	Norblad
Abbitt	Ford	
Abernethy	Forrester	
Adair	Fugate	
Allen, Calif.	Fulton	
Allen, Ill.	Gamble	
Allen, La.	Gary	
Andersen,	Gavin	
H. Carl	George	
Anderson, Calif.	Golden	
Andrews	Goldwin	
August H.	Gossett	
Andrews	Graham	
Arends	Grant	
Armstrong	Greenwood	
Auchincloss	Gross	
Ayres	Gwinn	
Baker	Hale	
Bakewell	Hall	
Barden	Edwin Arthur	
Bates, Mass.	Hall	
Battle	Leonard W.	
Beall	Halleck	
Beamer	Hand	
Belcher	Harden	
Bender	Hardy	
Bennett, F'a.	Harris	
Bennett, Mich.	Harrison, Va.	
Bentsen	Harrison, Wyo.	
Berry	Harvey	
Betts	Herlong	
Bishop	Hertel	
Blackney	Heselton	
Boggs, Del.	Hess	
Boggs, La.	Hill	
Bolton	Hillings	
Bow	Hoeven	
Bray	Hoffman, Ill.	
Brehm	Hoffman, Mich.	
Brown, Ohio	Hope	
Brownson	Hunter	
Bryson	James	
Budge	Jenison	
Buffett	Jenkins	
Burleson	Jensen	
Burton	Johnson	
Busbey	Jonas	
Bush	Jones	
Butler	Hamilton C.	
Byrnes, Wis.	Jones	
Canfield	Woodrow W.	
Carlyle	Judd	
Case	Kean	
Chenoweth	Kearney	
Chipperfield	Kearns	
Church	Keating	
Clevenger	Kilburn	
Cole, Kans.	Kilday	
Colmer	Lantaff	
Corbett	Larcade	
Cotton	Latham	
Cox	LeCompte	
Crawford	Lovre	
Crumpacker	Lucas	
Cunningham	McConnell	
Curtis, Nebr.	McCulloch	
Dague	McDonough	
Davis, Ga.	McGregor	
Davis, Wis.	McMillan	
DeGraffenried	McMullen	
Denny	McVey	
Devereux	Martin, Iowa	
D'Ewart	Martin, Mass.	
Dolliver	Mason	
Dondero	Meador	
Donohue	Merrow	
Donovan	Miller, Md.	
Doughton	Miller, Nebr.	
Durham	Miller, N. Y.	
Eaton	Morano	
Ellsworth	Morton	
Elston	Mumma	
Fallon	Nelson	
Fellows	Nicholson	
Fenton	Nicholson	

NAYS—152

Addonizio	Garmatz	Morgan
Albert	Gathings	Morris
Anfuso	Gordon	Morrison
Angell	Granahan	Moulder
Aspinall	Granger	Multer
Bailey	Green	Murdock
Baring	Gregory	Murphy
Barrett	Hagen	O'Brien, Ill.
Bates, Ky.	Hart	O'Brien, Mich.
Beckworth	Havenner	O'Konski
Blatnik	Hays, Ark.	O'Neill
Bolling	Hays, Ohio	O'Toole
Bonner	Hedrick	Patman
Bosone	Heffernan	Perkins
Breen	Heller	Poage
Brown, Ga.	Holmes	Preston
Buckley	Horan	Price
Burdick	Howell	Priest
Burnside	Hull	Quinn
Byrne, N. Y.	Jackson, Wash.	Rabaut
Camp	Jarman	Ramsay
Cannon	Javits	Rankin
Carnahan	Jones, Ala.	Rhodes
Celler	Jones, Mo.	Roberts
Chelf	Karsten, Mo.	Rodino
Chudoff	Kelly, N. Y.	Rogers, Colo.
Clemente	Kennedy	Rogers, Fla.
Combs	Keogh	Rooney
Cooley	Kerr	Roosevelt
Cooper	King	Sabath
Crosser	Kirwan	Shelley
Davis, Tenn.	Kluczynski	Sheppard
Dawson	Lane	Sieminski
Deane	Lanham	Spence
Delaney	Lesinski	Staggers
Dempsey	Lind	Steed
Denton	Lyle	Stigler
Dollinger	McCarthy	Stockman
Dorn	McCormack	Sutton
Doyle	McGuire	Thomas
Eberhart	McKinnon	Thornberry
Engle	Machrowicz	Tollefson
Evins	Mack, Ill.	Trimble
Feighan	Mack, Wash.	Welch
Fernandez	Madden	Wickersham
Fine	Magee	Wier
Flood	Mahon	Withrow
Fogarty	Marshall	Yates
Forand	Miller, Calif.	Yorty
Frazier	Mills	Zablocki
Furcolo	Mitchell	

NOT VOTING—34

Boykin	Hinshaw	Rains
Bramblett	Holifield	Redden
Brooks	Irving	Reed, N. Y.
Chatham	Jackson, Calif.	Rivers
Cole, N. Y.	Kee	Vaughn
Coudert	Kelley, Pa.	Vinson
Curtis, Mo.	Kersten, Wis.	Watts
Dingell	Klein	Whitaker
Elliott	Mansfield	Widnall
Gillette	Murray, Tenn.	Woodruff
Gore	Murray, Wis.	
Hébert	Powell	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Klein against.
 Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Whitaker against.
 Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Mansfield against.
 Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Dingell against.
 Mr. Vaughn for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.
 Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Kee against.
 Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Holifield against.
 Mr. Redden for, with Mr. Irving against.
 Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Powell against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Woodruff.
 Mr. Boykin with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Chatham with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Vinson with Mr. Widnall.
 Mr. Elliott with Mr. Bramblett.
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Cole of New York.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it does not relate to the merits. What is it?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I just want to say to my friend from New York that it occurred to me that in order to accommodate some Members who would like to leave we might have two more roll calls and finish the balance tomorrow.

In view of the apparent desire of the Members to continue, I withdraw the request.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 19, strike out "\$67,500,000" and insert "\$62,000,000."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 225, nays 167, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 42]

YEAS—225

Aandahl	Curtis, Nebr.	Hunter
Abbitt	Dague	James
Abernethy	Davis, Ga.	Jenison
Adair	Davis, Wis.	Jenkins
Allen, Calif.	Denny	Jensen
Allen, Ill.	Devereux	Jonas
Allen, La.	D'Ewart	Jones
Andersen,	Dolliver	Hamilton C.
H. Carl	Dondero	Jones,
Anderson, Calif.	Donovan	Woodrow W.
Andrews	Doughton	Judd
August H.	Eaton	Kean
Andrews	Elston	Kearney
Arends	Fallon	Kearns
Armstrong	Fellows	Keating
Auchincloss	Fenton	Kennedy
Ayres	Fisher	Kilburn
Bakewell	Ford	Kilday
Barden	Forrester	Latham
Bates, Mass.	Fugate	LeCompte
Battle	Fulton	Lind
Beall	Gamble	Lovre
Beamer	Garmatz	Lucas
Belcher	Gary	McConnell
Bender	Gathings	McCulloch
Bennett, Mich.	Gavin	McDonough
Berry	George	McGrath
Betts	Golden	McGregor
Bishop	Goodwin	McMillan
Blackney	Gossett	McVey
Boggs, Del.	Graham	Martin, Iowa
Boggs, La.	Grant	Martin, Mass.
Bolton	Greenwood	Mason
Bow	Gross	Meador
Boykin	Gwinn	Merrow
Bray	Hale	Miller, Md.
Brehm	Hall	Miller, Nebr.
Brown, Ohio	Edwin Arthur	Miller, N. Y.
Brownson	Hall	Morano
Budge	Leonard W.	Morton
Buffett	Halleck	Mumma
Burton	Hand	Nelson
Busbey	Harden	Nicholson
Bush	Hardy	O'Hara
Butler	Harris	Ostertag
Byrnes, Wis.	Harrison, Va.	Passman
Carlyle	Harrison, Wyo.	Patten
Chenoweth	Harvey	Patterson
Chipperfield	Herlong	Phillips
Church	Hertel	Pickett
Clevenger	Heselton	Potter
Cole, Kans.	Hess	Poulson
Colmer	Hill	Prouty
Corbett	Hillings	Radwan
Cotton	Hoeven	Reece, Tenn.
Crawford	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, Ill.
Crumpacker	Hoffman, Mich.	Rees, Kans.
Cunningham	Hope	Regan

Riblicoff
Riehlman
Roberts
Robeson
Rogers, Tex.
Sadlak
St. George
Sasscer
Saylor
Schwabe
Scott, Hardie
Scott,
Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Scudder
Secrest
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sheehan
Short

Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sittler
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stanley
Stefan
Taber
Tackett
Talle
Taylor
Teague
Thompson,
Mich.
Thompson, Tex.
Towe
Vail
Van Pelt

NAYS—167

Addonizio
Albert
Anfuso
Angell
Aspinall
Bailey
Baker
Baring
Barrett
Bates, Ky.
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Bentsen
Blatnik
Bolling
Bonner
Bosone
Breen
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buckley
Burdick
Burleson
Burnside
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Canfield
Cannon
Carnahan
Case
Celler
Chelf
Chudoff
Clemente
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Cresser
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Deane
DeGraffenried
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
Dollinger
Donohue
Dorn
Doyle
Durham
Ellsworth
Engle
Evins
Fernandez
Fine
Flood

Fogarty
Forand
Frazier
Furcolo
Gordon
Granahan
Granger
Green
Gregory
Hagen
Hart
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hedrick
Heffernan
Heller
Holmes
Horan
Howell
Hull
Jackson, Wash.
Jarman
Javits
Johnson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten, Mo.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kerr
King
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Lane
Lanham
Lantaff
Lesinski
Lyle
McCarthy
McCormack
McGuire
McKinnon
McMullen
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Mahon
Marshall
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Mitchell
Morgan
Morris
Morrison

Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Murphy
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Toole
Patman
Perkins
Phillbin
Poage
Polk
Preston
Price
Priest
Quinn
Rabaut
Ramsay
Rankin
Reams
Rhodes
Riley
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sabath
Shelley
Sheppard
Sieminski
Sikes
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Stigler
Stockman
Sutton
Thomas
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Welch
Whitten
Wickersham
Wier
Willis
Withrow
Yates
Yorty
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—41

Bramblett
Brooks
Chatham
Cole, N. Y.
Coudert
Cox
Curtis, Mo.
Dingell
Eberharther
Elliott
Feighan
Gillette
Gore
Hébert

Hinshaw
Hollifield
Irving
Jackson, Calif.
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kersten, Wis.
Klein
Larcade
Latham
Mansfield
Murray, Tenn.
Murray, Wis.
O'Neill

Powell
Rains
Redden
Reed, N. Y.
Richards
Rivers
Rogers, Mass.
Vaughn
Vinson
Watts
Whitaker
Woodruff

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Klein against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Whitaker against.
Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Mansfield against.

Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Dingell against.
Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.
Mr. Vaughn for, with Mr. Hollifield against.
Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Irving against.

Mr. Redden for, with Mr. Eberharther against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Feighan against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Magee against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Brooks with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Bramblett.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs of Louisiana). The Clerk will report the next amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 6, line 25, strike out "\$7,700,000" and insert "\$6,900,000, of which \$1,200,000 shall be used for soil and moisture conservation."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 249, nays 148, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 43]

YEAS—249

Abbott
Abernethy
Adair
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Andersen
H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, N. Y.
August H.
Andrews
Arends
Armstrong
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Bakewell
Barden
Bates, Mass.
Battle
Beall
Beamer
Beckworth
Belcher
Bender
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Betts
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Boggs, La.
Bolton
Bow
Boykin
Bray
Brehm
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Bryson
Buffett
Burleson
Burton
Busbey
Bush
Butler
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Carlyle
Case
Chelf
Chipfield
Church

Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Colmer
Corbett
Cotton
Cox
Crawford
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Nebr.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
DeGraffenried
Denny
Devereux
Dolliver
Dondero
Donohue
Donovan
Doughton
Durham
Eaton
Elston
Evins
Fallon
Fellows
Fenton
Fisher
Ford
Forrester
Fugate
Fulton
Gamble
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
George
Golden
Goodwin
Gossett
Graham
Grant
Gross
Gwinn
Hale
Hall
Edwin Arthur
Hall
Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Harden

Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harvey
Hedrick
Herlong
Hertel
Heslton
Hess
Hillings
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Hunter
James
Jarman
Jenison
Jenkins
Jensen
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones,
Hamilton C.
Judd
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kennedy
Kilburn
Kilday
Lane
Lantaff
Larcade
Latham
LeCompte
Lind
Lover
Lucas
Lyle
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McMillan
McMullen
McVey
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Masen
Meador

Morrow
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Morano
Morton
Mumma
Nelson
Nicholson
O'Hara
Ostertag
Passman
Patterson
Philbin
Phillips
Pickett
Poage
Potter
Poulson
Prouty
Radwan
Reams
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Rees, Kans.
Regan
Ribicoff
Richards
Riehlman
Riley
Roberts
Robeson

Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Sadlak
St. George
Sasscer
Saylor
Schwabe
Scott, Hardie
Scott,
Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Scudder
Secrest
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sheehan
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sittler
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stanley
Steed
Stefan
Taber
Tackett

NAYS—148

Addonizio
Albert
Anfuso
Angell
Aspinall
Bailey
Baring
Barrett
Bates, Ky.
Bentsen
Berry
Blatnik
Bolling
Bonner
Bosone
Breen
Brown, Ga.
Buckley
Budge
Burdick
Burnside
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Cannon
Carnahan
Celler
Chenoweth
Chudoff
Clemente
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Cresser
Dawson
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
D'Ewart
Dollinger
Dorn
Doyle
Eberharther
Ellsworth
Engle
Feighan
Fernandez
Fine
Flood

Fogarty
Forand
Frazier
Furcolo
Gordon
Granahan
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gregory
Hagen
Harrison, Wyo.
Hart
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Heffernan
Heller
Hill
Holmes
Horan
Howell
Hull
Jackson, Wash.
Javits
Johnson
Jones, Mo.
Karsten, Mo.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kerr
King
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Lanham
Lesinski
McCarthy
McCormack
McGrath
McGuire
McKinnon
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magee
Mahon
Marshall
Miller, Calif.
Mills

Mitchell
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Murphy
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Toole
Patman
Patten
Perkins
Polk
Preston
Price
Priest
Quinn
Rabaut
Ramsay
Rankin
Rhodes
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sabath
Shelley
Sheppard
Sieminski
Spence
Staggers
Stigler
Stockman
Sutton
Tollefson
Trimble
Welch
Wickersham
Wier
Withrow
Yates
Yorty
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—36

Bramblett
Brooks
Chatham
Cole, N. Y.
Coudert
Curtis, Mo.
Davis, Tenn.
Dingell
Elliott
Gillette
Gore
Hébert

Hinshaw
Hollifield
Irving
Jackson, Calif.
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kersten, Wis.
Klein
Mansfield
Murray, Tenn.
Murray, Wis.
O'Neill

Powell
Rains
Redden
Reed, N. Y.
Rivers
Vaughn
Vinson
Watts
Whitaker
Widnall
Williams, N. Y.
Woodruff

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Whitaker against.
Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Mansfield against.
Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Dingell against.
Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.
Mr. Vaughn for, with Mr. Holifield against.
Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Irving against.
Mr. Redden for, with Mr. O'Neill against.
Mr. Williams of New York for, with Mr. Powell against.
Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Kee against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Murray of Tennessee with Mr. Bramblett.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 15, line 10, after the word "expended", strike out "\$5,000,000, of which \$4,265,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,000,000, of which \$3,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 16, line 2, strike out "\$207,190,000" and insert "\$197,000,000."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. On that amendment, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 237, nays 160, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

YEAS—237

Abbott	Buffett	Fugate
Abernethy	Burleson	Fulton
Adair	Burton	Gamble
Allen, Calif.	Busbey	Garmatz
Allen, Ill.	Bush	Gary
Allen, La.	Butler	Gathings
Andersen,	Byrnes, Wls.	Gavin
H. Carl	Canfield	George
Anderson, Calif.	Carlyle	Golden
Andresen,	Case	Goodwin
August H.	Chipherfield	Gossett
Andrews	Church	Graham
Arends	Clevenger	Grant
Armstrong	Cole, Kans.	Gross
Auchincloss	Colmer	Gwinn
Ayres	Corbett	Hale
Baker	Cotton	Hall
Barden	Cox	Edwin Arthur
Bates, Mass.	Crawford	Hall
Battle	Crumpacker	Leonard W.
Beall	Cunningham	Halleck
Beamer	Curtis, Nebr.	Hand
Belcher	Dague	Harden
Bender	Davis, Ga.	Hardy
Bennett, Fla.	Davis, Wls.	Harris
Bennett, Mich.	Denny	Harrison, Va.
Bentsen	Devereux	Harvey
Betts	Dolliver	Hedrick
Bishop	Dondero	Herlong
Blackney	Donohue	Herter
Boggs, Del.	Donovan	Heseltan
Boggs, La.	Doughton	Hess
Bolton	Durham	Hillings
Bonner	Elston	Hoeven
Bow	Fallon	Hoffman, Ill.
Boykin	Fellows	Hope
Bray	Fenton	James
Brehm	Fisher	Jarman
Brown, Ohio	Fogarty	Javits
Brownson	Ford	Jenison
Bryson	Forrester	

Jenkins	Mumma	Simpson, Ill.
Jensen	Nelson	Simpson, Pa.
Jonas	Nicholson	Sittler
Jones,	Norblad	Smith, Kans.
Hamilton C.	O'Hara	Smith, Va.
Jones,	Ostertag	Smith, Wis.
Woodrow W.	Passman	Springer
Judd	Patterson	Stanley
Kean	Philbin	Steed
Kearney	Phillips	Stefan
Kearns	Pickett	Taber
Keating	Poage	Tackett
Kennedy	Potter	Talle
Kilburn	Poulson	Taylor
Kilday	Prouty	Teague
Lane	Radwan	Thompson,
Lantaff	Reams	Mich.
Latham	Reece, Tenn.	Thompson, Tex.
LeCompte	Reed, Ill.	Thornberry
Lind	Rees, Kans.	Towe
Lovre	Ribicoff	Vail
Lucas	Richards	Van Pelt
Lyle	Riehlman	Van Zandt
McConnell	Robeson	Velde
McCulloch	Rogers, Mass.	Vorys
McDonough	Rogers, Tex.	Vursell
McGregor	Sadiak	Walter
McMillan	St. George	Weichel
McMullen	Sasser	Wharton
McVey	Saylor	Wheeler
Martin, Iowa	Schwabe	Whitten
Martin, Mass.	Scott, Hardie	Wigglesworth
Mason	Scott,	Williams, Miss.
Meador	Hugh D., Jr.	Wilson, Ind.
Merron	Scrivner	Wilson, Tex.
Miller, Md.	Scudder	Winstead
Miller, Nebr.	Secrest	Wolcott
Miller, N. Y.	Shafer	Wolverton
Mills	Sheehan	Wood, Ga.
Morano	Short	Wood, Idaho
Morton	Sikes	

NAYS—160

Aandahl	Forand	Multer
Addonizio	Frazier	Murdock
Albert	Furcolo	Murphy
Anfuso	Gordon	Norrell
Angell	Granahan	O'Brien, Ill.
Aspinall	Granger	O'Brien, Mich.
Bailey	Green	O'Konski
Bakewell	Greenwood	O'Neill
Baring	Gregory	O'Toole
Barrett	Hagen	Patman
Bates, Ky.	Harrison, Wyo.	Patten
Beckworth	Hart	Perkins
Berry	Havener	Polk
Blatnik	Hays, Ark.	Preston
Bolling	Hays, Ohio	Price
Bosone	Heffernan	Priest
Breen	Heller	Quinn
Brown, Ga.	Hill	Rabaut
Buckley	Holmes	Ramsay
Budge	Horan	Rankin
Burdick	Howell	Regan
Burnside	Hull	Rhodes
Byrne, N. Y.	Hunter	Riley
Camp	Jackson, Wash.	Roberts
Cannon	Johnson	Rodino
Carnahan	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Colo.
Celler	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Fla.
Chelf	Karsten, Mo.	Rooney
Chenoweth	Kelly, N. Y.	Roosevelt
Chudoff	Keogh	Sabath
Clemente	Kerr	Seely-Brown
Combs	King	Shelley
Cooley	Kirwan	Sheppard
Cooper	Kluczynski	Sieminski
Crosser	Lanham	Smith, Miss.
Davis, Tenn.	Lesinski	Spence
Dawson	McCarthy	Staggers
Deane	McCormack	Stigler
DeGraffenried	McGrath	Stockman
Delaney	McGuire	Sutton
Dempsey	McKinnon	Thomas
Denton	Machrowicz	Tollefson
D'Ewart	Mack, Ill.	Trimble
Dollinger	Mack, Wash.	Welch
Dorn	Madden	Werdel
Doyle	Magee	Wickersham
Eberharther	Mahon	Wier
Ellsworth	Marshall	Willis
Engle	Miller, Calif.	Withrow
Evin	Mitchell	Yates
Feighan	Morgan	Yorty
Fernandez	Morris	Zablocki
Fine	Morrison	
Flood	Moulder	

NOT VOTING—36

Bramblett	Coudert	Elliott
Brooks	Curtis, Mo.	Gillette
Chatham	Dingell	Gore
Cole, N. Y.	Eaton	Hébert

Hinshaw	Larcade	Rivers
Holifield	Mansfield	Vaughn
Irving	Murray, Tenn.	Vinson
Jackson, Calif.	Murray, Wls.	Watts
Kee	Powell	Whitaker
Kelley, Pa.	Rains	Widnall
Kersten, Wis.	Redden	Williams, N. Y.
Klein	Reed, N. Y.	Woodruff

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Klein against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Whitaker against.
Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Mansfield against.
Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Dingell against.
Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.
Mr. Vaughn for, with Mr. Holifield against.
Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Irving against.
Mr. Redden for, with Mr. Powell against.
Mr. Williams of New York for, with Mr. Kee against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Bramblett.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.
Mr. Murray of Tennessee with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. WERDEL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 3, strike out the period and insert "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 226, nays 165, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

YEAS—226

Abbott	Bolton	Crawford
Abernethy	Bonner	Crumpacker
Adair	Bow	Cunningham
Allen, Calif.	Boykin	Curtis, Nebr.
Allen, Ill.	Bray	Dague
Allen, La.	Brehm	Davis, Ga.
Anderson, Calif.	Brown, Ohio	Davis, Wls.
Andresen,	Brownson	Denny
August H.	Bryson	Devereux
Andrews	Budge	D'Ewart
Arends	Buffett	Dondero
Armstrong	Burleson	Donohue
Auchincloss	Burnside	Donovan
Ayres	Burton	Doughton
Baker	Busbey	Durham
Bakewell	Bush	Ellsworth
Barden	Butler	Elston
Bates, Mass.	Byrnes, Wls.	Fallon
Battle	Canfield	Fellows
Beall	Carlyle	Fenton
Beamer	Chenoweth	Fisher
Belcher	Chipherfield	Ford
Bender	Church	Fugate
Bennett, Fla.	Clevenger	Fulton
Betts	Cole, Kans.	Gamble
Bishop	Colmer	Gary
Blackney	Corbett	Gathings
Boggs, Del.	Cotton	Gavin
Boggs, La.	Cox	George

Golden
Goodwin
Gossett
Graham
Grant
Gwinn
Hale
Hall
Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Hand
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harrison, Wyo.
Harvey
Hedrick
Herlong
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hill
Hillings
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Hope
Hunter
James
Jarman
Jenison
Jenkins
Jensen
Jonas
Jones, Hamilton C.
Jones, Woodrow W.
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kilburn
Kilday
Lantaff
Latham
Lucas

McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGrath
McGregor
McMillan
McMullen
McVey
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Meador
Merrow
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Morano
Morton
Mumma
Nelson
Nicholson
Norrell
Ostertag
Passman
Patterson
Phillips
Pickett
Polk
Potter
Poulson
Prouty
Radwan
Reams
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Rees, Kans.
Regan
Richards
Riehlman
Robeson
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Sadlak
St. George
Saylor
Schwabe

Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Scudder
Secrest
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sheehan
Sheppard
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sittler
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stanley
Stefan
Taber
Tackett
Taylor
Teague
Thompson, Mich.
Towe
Vail
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Walter
Weichel
Werdell
Wharton
Wheeler
Wiggiesworth
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood, Ga.
Wood, Idaho

NAYS—165

Aandahl
Addonizio
Albert
Andersen, H. Carl
Anfuso
Angell
Aspinall
Bailey
Baring
Barrett
Bates, Ky.
Beckworth
Bennett, Mich.
Bentsen
Berry
Blatnik
Bolling
Bosone
Breen
Brown, Ga.
Buckley
Burdick
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Cannon
Carnahan
Celler
Chelf
Chudoff
Clemente
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Cresser
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Deane
DeGraffenried
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
Dollinger
Dolliver
Dorn
Doyle
Eberhart
Engle
Evins
Feighan
Fernandez

Fine
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Frazier
Furcolo
Garmatz
Gordon
Granahan
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gregory
Gross
Hagen
Hart
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Heffernan
Heller
Hoever
Holmes
Horan
Howell
Hull
Jackson, Wash.
Javits
Johnson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten, Mo.
Kelly, N. Y.
Kennedy
Keogh
Kerr
King
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Lane
Lanham
LeCompte
Lesinski
Lind
Love
Lyle
McCarthy
McCormack
McGuire
McKinnon
Machrowicz

Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Mahon
Marshall
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Mitchell
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara
O'Konski
O'Neill
O'Toole
Patman
Patten
Perkins
Poage
Preston
Price
Priest
Quinn
Rabaut
Ramsay
Rankin
Rhodes
Riley
Roberts
Rodino
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sabath
Sasser
Shelley
Sieminski
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Stigler
Stockman
Sutton
Talle
Thomas

Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Tolleson
Trimble
Welch

Whitten
Wickersham
Wier
Winstead
Withrow

Yates
Yorty
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—42

Bramblett
Brooks
Case
Chatham
Cole, N. Y.
Coudert
Curtis, Mo.
Dingell
Eaton
Elliott
Forrester
Gillette
Gore
Halleck

Hébert
Hinshaw
Hollifield
Irving
Jackson, Calif.
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kersten, Wis.
Klein
Larcade
Magee
Mansfield
Murphy
Murray, Tenn.

Murray, Wis.
Powell
Rains
Redden
Reed, N. Y.
Ribicoff
Rivers
Vaughn
Vinson
Watts
Whitaker
Widnall
Williams, N. Y.
Woodruff

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Klein against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Whitaker against.
Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Mansfield against.
Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Dingell against.
Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.
Mr. Vaughn for, with Mr. Hollifield against.
Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Irving against.
Mr. Redden for, with Mr. Magee against.
Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Murphy against.
Mr. Williams of New York for, with Mr. Powell against.
Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Kee against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Case.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Bramblett.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Murray of Tennessee with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 42, after line 21, insert a new section, as follows:

"No part of any appropriation or authorizations contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the agency;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies and school teachers in the Indian Service;

"(e) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2;

"(f) to law-enforcement officers;

"*Provided further*, That when any department or agency covered in this bill shall, as a result of the operation of this amendment, reduce their employment to a figure not exceeding 80 percent of the total number on their rolls as of July 1, 1951, such amendment shall cease to apply and said 80-percent figure shall become a ceiling for employ-

ment during the fiscal year 1952 and if exceeded at any time during fiscal year 1952 this amendment shall again become operative."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington (interrupting reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the Jensen amendment?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 224, nays 169, answered "present" 1, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

YEAS—224

Aandahl
Abbott
Abernethy
Adair
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Angell
Arends
Armstrong
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Bakewell
Barden
Bates, Mass.
Battle
Beall
Beamer
Belcher
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Bolton
Bow
Boykin
Bray
Brehm
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Bryson
Budge
Buffett
Burleson
Burton
Busbey
Bush
Butler
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Carlyle
Case
Chelf
Chipperfield
Church
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Colmer
Cooper
Corbett

Cotton
Cox
Crawford
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Nebr.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Denton
Devereux
D'Ewart
Dolliver
Dondero
Donovan
Doughton
Ellsworth
Elston
Evins
Fallon
Fellows
Fenton
Fisher
Ford
Frazier
Fugate
Fulton
Gamble
Gathings
Gavin
George
Golden
Goodwin
Gossett
Graham
Gross
Gwinn
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Hand
Harden
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harrison, Wyo.
Harvey
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hill
Hillings
Hoever
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holmes

Hope
Horan
Hunter
James
Jarman
Jenison
Jenkins
Jensen
Johnson
Jonas
Jones, Woodrow W.
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kennedy
Kilburn
Lanham
Larcade
Latham
LeCompte
Love
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McMillan
McVey
Mack, Wash.
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Meador
Merrow
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Morano
Mumma
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
O'Hara
Ostertag
Patterson
Phillips
Pickett
Potter
Poulson
Prouty
Radwan
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Rees, Kans.
Regan

Ribicoff
Richards
Riehlman
Rogers, Mass.
Sadlak
St. George
Saylor
Schwabe
Scott, Hardie
Scott,
Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sheehan
Short
Simpson, Ill.

Simpson, Pa.
Sittler
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stanley
Stefan
Sutton
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague
Thompson,
Mich.
Tollefson
Towe
Vail

Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Welchel
Werdel
Wharton
Wheeler
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood, Ga.
Wood, Idaho

NAYS—169

Addonizio
Albert
Allen, La.
Anfuso
Aspinall
Bailey
Baring
Barrett
Bates, Ky.
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Bentsen
Blatnik
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Bonner
Bosone
Breen
Brown, Ga.
Buckley
Burdick
Burnside
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Cannon
Carnahan
Celler
Chudoff
Clemente
Combs
Cooley
Cresser
Dawson
Deane
DeGraffenried
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
Dollinger
Donohue
Dorn
Doyle
Durham
Eberhart
Engle
Feighan
Fernandez
Fine
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Furcolo
Garmatz
Gary
Gordon
Granahan
Granger

Grant
Green
Greenwood
Gregory
Hardy
Hart
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hedrick
Heffernan
Heller
Herlong
Howell
Hull
Jackson, Wash.
Javits
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones,
Hamilton C.
Karsten, Mo.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kerr
Kilday
King
Kirwan
Kluczyński
Lane
Lantaff
Lesinski
Lind
Lucas
Lyle
McCarthy
McCormack
McGrath
McGuire
McKinnon
McMullen
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Magee
Mahon
Marshall
Miller, Calif.
Mitchell
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.

O'Brien, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neill
O'Toole
Passman
Patman
Patten
Perkins
Philbin
Poage
Polk
Preston
Price
Priest
Quinn
Rabaut
Ramsey
Rankin
Reams
Rhodes
Riley
Roberts
Robeson
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sabath
Sasser
Secret
Shelley
Sheppard
Sieminski
Sikes
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Stigler
Stockman
Tackett
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Walter
Welch
Whitten
Wickersham
Wier
Willis
Withrow
Yates
Yorty
Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Chenoweth

NOT VOTING—39

Bramblett
Brooks
Chatham
Cole, N. Y.
Coudert
Curtis, Mo.
Dingell
Eaton
Elliott
Forrester
Gillette
Gore
Halleck

Hébert
Hinshaw
Holifield
Irving
Jackson, Calif.
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kersten, Wis.
Klein
Mansfield
Murphy
Murray, Tenn.
Murray, Wis.

Powell
Rains
Redden
Reed, N. Y.
Rivers
Rogers, Tex.
Vaughn
Vinson
Watts
Whitaker
Widnall
Williams, N. Y.
Woodruff

Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Dingell against.
Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Kelley of Penn-
sylvania against.

Mr. Vaughn for, with Mr. Holifield against.
Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr.
Irving against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Chenoweth
against.

Mr. Redden for, with Mr. Kee against.

Mr. Williams of New York for, with Mr.

Powell against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr.

Murphy against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Larcade with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Bramblett.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Woodruff.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK. Had he been present he would have voted "yea". I voted "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR'S SPEECH

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, in view of the great interest in the speech of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, that it may be ordered printed as a House document.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentlewoman from Massachusetts should refer that to the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill for that purpose, but I had hoped we could get it done by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not like to start doing things like that; it is very unusual. We do have a Joint Committee on Printing.

The Chair cannot entertain the request.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative business of the day and the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I am advised that on roll call 39, on which I qualified and voted "aye," that I am not recorded. I ask unanimous consent that the Journal and Record may be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be so recorded.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, on roll call 40 I was present and answered "no," but I am advised that I am not recorded. I ask unanimous consent that the Record and Journal may be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Wisconsin will be so recorded.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, is the Speaker inclined to recognize Members to address the House for 1 minute at this point?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would advise the gentleman from New York that there is more than an hour of special orders on the calendar, in which the gentleman from New York himself has 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Just as the Speaker says, I have a special order, but I can say what I want to say in 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman desires to take the minute instead, the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my special order be canceled.

TELEVISION CONGRESS

(Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am today placing on the Speaker's desk, available for signature by Members, a discharge petition for House Resolution 62—discharge petition No. 3—to provide for televising and broadcasting important debates in the House of Representatives.

The Rules Committee does not now look with favor upon this bill, although it carefully leaves full control over such televising and broadcasting to the Speaker. I am not criticizing the Rules Committee as I can fully appreciate the sincerity of the reservations which members of that committee expressed at the hearing on this bill. It seems to me, however, that the public demand for it is so great—the latest Gallup poll finds that 70 percent of the people want Congress televised—and our need for interesting the people in government so vital considering the world situation—as to require an extension of the public galleries of the House of Representatives to include every living room in the country when important matters are up for debate.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Mansfield against.

The televised debates of the UN Security Council and the disclosures on links between the underworld and Government officials so forcibly brought out on television by the Senate Crime Investigating Committee have had an impact on our people which cannot be denied. I have no doubt that the march of progress will in due course result in the televising and broadcasting of important House debates—the principal broadcasters have already assured adequate coverage—but if the people want it now it is they who will have to demand it. The discharge petition makes this opportunity available.

The text of the resolution follows:

House Resolution 62

Resolution to amend rule XXXV of the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for televising and broadcasting of sessions of the House of Representatives

Resolved, That the paragraph numbered 3 of rule XXXV of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"3. Such portion of the gallery of the House of Representatives as may be necessary to accommodate reporters of news to be disseminated by television, radio, wireless, and similar methods of transmission wishing to report debates and proceedings and to broadcast and televise the same, shall be set aside for their use, and reputable reporters thus engaged shall be admitted thereto under such regulations as the Speaker may from time to time prescribe; and the supervision of such gallery, including the designation of its employees, shall be vested in a standing committee of television and radio reporters, subject to the direction and control of the Speaker; and the Speaker may admit to the floor, under such regulations as he may prescribe, one representative of the National Broadcasting Co., one representative of the American Broadcasting Co., one representative of the Columbia Broadcasting System, one representative of the Mutual Broadcasting System, one representative of the DuMont Television Network, and one representative of the Transradio Press Service, and one representative each of such other radio or television broadcasters as the Speaker may from time to time consider to be appropriate in the interests of the adequate coverage of debates and proceedings in accordance with this paragraph."

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE REPUBLICANS MUST LEAD THE WAY

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I made a speech on the floor of the House in which I discussed the financial situation of our country. At that time I cited the great problems of our day arising from the extravagance of the Federal Government despite the threat of war. I made five points in that talk which I might well summarize. These were:

First. In the absence of a continuing determination to economize and the lack of leadership in compelling the hodgepodge of bureaus, departments and agencies to cooperate, the Federal Government is spending entirely too much money. We Republicans with the help of a number of Democrats saved about \$30,000,000 today by striking out ex-

hibited amounts from the appropriations bill.

Second. Too much money and property is being given away.

Third. Too much Federal money, extracted from taxpayers, is being loaned too freely.

Fourth. The Federal Government itself is guilty of creating inflation although it piously preaches against it.

Fifth. Great savings can be made by eliminating wasteful practices in all branches of the military services without impairing any of their effectiveness.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss my first point. Many a Government has been wrecked on the shoals of loose fiscal policies. We can and must remedy this situation.

The President, as head of the executive department of the government can save more money than any man in the Government and he can spend more money than any man in the Government. In spite of his claims that he wishes to economize he is the most reckless spender of any of our presidents. A glance at the expenditures made for his personal use will show that he is not thrifty. If President Truman would give up his palatial political yacht he would save hundreds of thousands of dollars a year. Just a few days ago he ordered \$881,000 to be set aside to construct a bomb-proof shelter in connection with the White House which has cost several millions dollars in repairs the past two years. There is a wide-spread belief that as long as such a large number of pinks and reds are kept in Federal service in Washington there is little danger that the Russians would bomb it.

Mr. Speaker, some years ago Congress set up a new Governmental department the purpose of which was to study and limit Government expenses and suggest economies. I refer to the Bureau of the Budget. This bureau was set up in 1921 and its purpose is expressed in its preamble as follows:

The Bureau, when directed by the President, shall make a detailed study of the departments and establishments for the purpose of enabling the President to determine what changes (with a view of securing greater economy and efficiency in the conduct of the public service) should be made in (1) the existing organization, activities, and methods of business of such departments or establishments; (2) the appropriations therefore; (3) the assignment of particular activities to a particular services; or (4) the regrouping of services.

The Bureau of the Budget has become absolutely an arm of the Executive in every respect. This Department started with a few employees but today it has a personnel of 505 persons who draw salaries in the amount of \$3,059,500 a year and which costs the Government a total of \$3,332,231 a year.

But what are we getting for these expenditures? Certainly not economy and efficiency. Even before the Hoover Commission began its tremendous task, we knew there was great waste, duplication, and inefficiency in the conduct of the Government. Then 2 years ago that Commission submitted its reports and proved that the situation was actually much worse than many of us had

suspected. With these reports citing so many examples of inefficiency it was hoped the Budget Bureau would finally get down to its job of securing economy and greater efficiency in the conduct of the public service. That the Bureau has not done this job, even with the Hoover reports to guide it, was made clear last fall by the Williams subcommittee investigation of employee utilization in the executive agencies. Overstaffing and waste were still found to be so bad that the committee was forced to conclude that the executive agencies could do a better job with fewer employees. About 1,000 new employees are added to the rolls every day.

The legislative department of the Government cannot escape its share of the responsibility to practice economy. When our forefathers set up our Government they thought they were making the legislative branch of the Government the most powerful branch, for it is the people's branch. But the Congress, on many occasions, has failed to defend its rights. The executive branch in the past 20 years has invaded the authority and the jurisdiction of Congress in many ways.

Under the Constitution not one single dollar of Federal money can be spent without the sanction of law. And all laws controlling the activities of the Government are passed by Congress. The most important power granted by the Constitution to Congress is the power to control the purse strings. All bills for raising revenue, under the Constitution, must be originated in the House of Representatives. And not one dollar of Federal money can be lawfully spent until after the House and Senate have collected the money and appropriated it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we, the Members of the Congress, the House and the Senate, must do our part. We must be careful with making appropriations. We must be able to say "No." I concede that it is often difficult for the Appropriations Committee of the House to know just what appropriations are necessary. Still, our attitude must be challenging because the executive branch is too often lax.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this matter of cutting down the expenses of Government so that the Government will not spend too much money is a job that must be participated in by all the money-spending functions of the Government. It will not be accomplished unless every tax-spending agency and every person having control over public funds realizes that a public office is a public trust.

When the Republicans were returned to power in the Eightieth Congress in 1946, we were able to balance the budget for the first time since Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected as President in 1932. The Eightieth Congress reduced the national debt by \$9,000,000,000, and it cut down Government expenses by about the same amount.

Now let us see in a little more detail how well the Eightieth Congress did in holding down spending, in spite of an uncooperative administration. A comparison of 1948 expenditures with the amounts the President wants to spend in

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3790

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 3 (legislative day, MAY 2), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

4 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
5 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-
6 ment of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30,
7 1952, namely:

8 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

9 ENFORCEMENT OF CONNALLY HOT OIL ACT

10 For expenses necessary for controlling the interstate
11 shipment of contraband oil as required by law (15 U. S. C.

1 715), including purchase of not to exceed three passenger
2 motor vehicles for replacement only, \$174,000.

3 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER

4 ADMINISTRATION

5 For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance
6 of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric
7 power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5
8 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as
9 applied to the southeastern power area, \$275,000.

10 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

11 Appropriations of the Southeastern Power Administra-
12 tion shall be available for purchase of not to exceed five
13 passenger motor vehicles. Appropriations made herein to
14 the Southeastern Power Administration shall be available
15 in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for
16 operation and maintenance shall be available only for the
17 service of the current fiscal year.

18 CONTINUING FUND, SOUTHEASTERN POWER

19 ADMINISTRATION

20 All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric
21 power and energy under the provisions of section 5 of the
22 Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (16 U. S. C.
23 825s), generated or purchased in the southeastern power
24 area, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States
25 as miscellaneous receipts, except that the Treasury shall

1 set up and maintain from such receipts a continuing fund of
2 \$50,000, and said fund shall be placed to the credit of the
3 Secretary, and shall be subject to check by him to defray
4 emergency expenses necessary to insure continuity of electric
5 service and continuous operation of Government facilities in
6 said area.

7 CONSTRUCTION, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

8 For construction and acquisition of transmission lines,
9 substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administra-
10 tive expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the pro-
11 visions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16
12 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area,
13 to remain available until expended, \$3,375,000, of which
14 not to exceed \$600,000 is for liquidation of obligations in-
15 curred pursuant to authority previously granted: *Provided*,
16 That this appropriation shall not be expended for the con-
17 struction of facilities designated as comprising the western
18 Missouri project.

19 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER
20 ADMINISTRATION

21 For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance
22 of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric
23 power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5
24 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as
25 applied to the southwestern power area, \$1,275,000.

1 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

2 Appropriations of the Southwestern Power Administra-
3 tion shall be available for purchase of not to exceed fifteen
4 passenger motor vehicles, of which eight shall be for re-
5 placement only. Appropriations made herein to the South-
6 western Power Administration shall be available in one fund,
7 except that the appropriation herein made for operation and
8 maintenance shall be available only for the service of the
9 current fiscal year.

10 COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For expenses made necessary by the Act establishing
13 a Commission of Fine Arts (40 U. S. C. 104), including
14 payment of actual traveling expenses of the members and
15 secretary of the Commission in attending meetings and
16 committee meetings of the Commission either within or out-
17 side the District of Columbia, to be disbursed on vouchers
18 approved by the Commission, \$20,000.

19 BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

20 CONSTRUCTION

21 For construction and acquisition of transmission lines,
22 substations, and appurtenant facilities, as authorized by law,
23 to remain available until expended, \$62,000,000, of which
24 not to exceed \$21,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations
25 incurred pursuant to authority previously granted.

1 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

2 For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance
3 of the Bonneville transmission system and of marketing
4 electric power and energy, \$5,250,000.

5 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

6 Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administration
7 shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed upon
8 the Administrator pursuant to law, including not to exceed
9 \$40,000 for services as authorized by Section 15 of the Act
10 of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including such services
11 at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem for individuals; pur-
12 chase of not to exceed twelve passenger motor vehicles of
13 which twelve shall be for replacement only; and purchase
14 (not to exceed two) of aircraft. Appropriations made herein
15 to the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available
16 in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for
17 operation and maintenance shall be available only for the
18 service of the current fiscal year.

19 Not to exceed 12 per centum of the appropriation for
20 construction herein made for the Bonneville Power Admin-
21 istration shall be available for construction work by force
22 account or on a hired-labor basis, except in case of emer-
23 gencies, local in character, so declared by the Bonneville
24 Power Administrator.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and performance of other functions, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, \$6,900,000, of which \$1,200,000 shall be used for soil and moisture conservation: *Provided*, That this appropriation may be expended on a reimbursable basis for surveys of lands other than those under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management shall be available for purchase of not to exceed thirty-two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and alteration and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities to which the United States has title: *Provided*, That of appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Land Management expenditures in connection with the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands shall be reimbursed from the 25 per centum referred to in section C, title II, of the Act approved August 28, 1937, of the special fund designated the "Oregon and California Land Grant Fund" and section 4 of the Act ap-

1 proved May 24, 1939, of the special fund designated the
2 "Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant Fund".

3 RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

4 For construction, purchase, and maintenance of range
5 improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and
6 10 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C.
7 315), sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received,
8 during the current fiscal year, as range improvement fees
9 under section 3 of said Act and of 25 per centum of all
10 moneys received, during the current fiscal year, under sec-
11 tion 15 of said Act, to remain available until expended.

12 PAYMENTS TO STATES (PROCEEDS OF SALES)

13 For payment to the several States of 5 per centum of
14 the net proceeds of sales of public lands and materials lying
15 within their limits, for the purpose of education or of
16 making public roads and improvements, sums equal to the
17 aggregate of all moneys received in accordance with sec-
18 tion 4 of the Act of June 26, 1934 (31 U. S. C. 725c),
19 during the current and succeeding fiscal years, and includ-
20 ing in the fiscal year 1952 the unappropriated balance of
21 receipts of prior fiscal years, to remain available until
22 expended.

23 PAYMENT TO OKLAHOMA (ROYALTIES)

24 For payment to the State of Oklahoma in lieu of all
25 State and local taxes upon tribal funds accruing under the

1 provisions of the joint resolution of June 12, 1926 (44
 2 Stat. 740), to be expended by the State in the same manner
 3 as if received under section 35 of the Act approved February
 4 25, 1920 (30 U. S. C. 191), sums equal to $37\frac{1}{2}$ per centum
 5 of the royalties received during the current and each suc-
 6 ceeding fiscal year, from the south half of Red River in
 7 Oklahoma under the provisions of said joint resolution of
 8 June 12, 1926, to remain available until expended.

9 LEASING OF GRAZING LANDS

10 For leasing State, county, or privately owned lands in
 11 accordance with the provisions of the Act of June 23, 1938
 12 (43 U. S. C. 315m-1), sums equal to the aggregate of
 13 all moneys received during the current and each succeeding
 14 fiscal year, in accordance with the Act of June 23, 1938
 15 (43 U. S. C. 315m-4), to remain available until expended.

16 PAYMENTS TO STATES (GRAZING FEES)

17 Sums not in excess of $33\frac{1}{3}$ per centum of all grazing fees
 18 received during the current and each succeeding fiscal year
 19 from each grazing district on Indian lands ceded to the
 20 United States for disposition under the public-land laws, to
 21 remain available until expended for payment to the State in
 22 which said lands are situated, in accordance with the pro-
 23 visions of section 11 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended
 24 (43 U. S. C. 315j).

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, \$65,-
000,000, to be available in not to exceed the amounts
indicated respectively for the following purposes:

Health, education, and welfare services: For expenses
necessary to provide health, education, and welfare services
for Indians, either directly or in cooperation with States and
other organizations, including payment (in advance or from
date of admission) of care, tuition, assistance, and other
expenses of Indians in boarding homes, institutions, or
schools; grants and other assistance to needy Indians; main-
tenance of law and order, and payment of rewards for
information or evidence concerning violations of law on
Indian reservations or lands; and operation of Indian arts
and crafts shops and museums; \$43,600,000.

Resources management: For expenses necessary for
management, development, improvement, and protection of
resources and appurtenant facilities under the jurisdiction of
the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including payment of irrigation
assessments and charges; acquisition of water rights; con-
ducting agricultural experiments and demonstrations; fur-
nishing plants or seed to Indians; advances for Indian indus-

1 trial and business enterprises; payment of expenses of Indian
2 fairs, including premiums for exhibits; and development of
3 Indian arts and crafts as authorized by law (25 U. S. C.
4 305), including expenses of exhibits; \$11,400,000.

5 Construction: For construction, major repair, and
6 improvement of irrigation and power systems, buildings,
7 utilities, roads and trails, and other facilities; acquisi-
8 tion of lands and interests in lands; preparation of lands
9 for farming; and architectural and engineering services
10 by contract; to remain available until expended, \$12,-
11 000,000, of which not to exceed \$3,125,000 is for
12 liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority
13 previously granted: *Provided*, That no part of the sum
14 herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of
15 land within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado,
16 New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming outside of
17 the boundaries of existing Indian reservations: *Provided*
18 *further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for
19 the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of
20 Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside or outside the
21 boundaries of existing reservations.

22 General administrative expenses: For expenses neces-
23 sary for the general administration of the Bureau of
24 Indian Affairs, including such expenses in field offices,
25 \$3,600,000.

1 Revolving fund for loans: For an additional amount
2 for loans as authorized by sections 10 and 11 of the Act
3 of June 18, 1934 (25 U. S. C. 470, 471), as amended
4 and supplemented, and section 1 of the Act of April 19,
5 1950 (Public Law 474), \$800,000.

6 Payment to Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians,
7 Oklahoma: For an additional amount for "Payment to
8 Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians, Oklahoma",
9 for defraying the expenses of making per capita payments
10 authorized by the Acts of June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 483),
11 and June 24, 1948 (Public Law 754, Eightieth Congress),
12 \$25,000.

13 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

14 Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except
15 the revolving fund for loans) shall be available for purchase
16 of not to exceed one hundred and ninety-one passenger
17 motor vehicles, of which one hundred and ninety-one shall
18 be for replacement only, which may be used for the trans-
19 portation of Indians; purchase of ice for official use of em-
20 ployees; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
21 of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including not to ex-
22 ceed \$5,000 for expenditure at rates for individuals not in
23 excess of \$50 per diem on irrigation and power matters,
24 when authorized by the Secretary; and expenses required
25 by continuing or permanent treaty provisions.

1 CLAIMS AND TREATY OBLIGATIONS

2 For fulfilling treaties with Senecas and Six Nations of
3 New York, Choctaws and Pawnees of Oklahoma, and pay-
4 ment to Indians of Sioux reservations, to be expended as
5 provided by law, such amounts as may be necessary after
6 June 30, 1951.

7 PROCEEDS FROM POWER

8 Sums not in excess of the amount of power revenues
9 covered into the Treasury during the current and each suc-
10 ceeding fiscal year to the credit of each of the power projects,
11 including revenues credited prior to August 7, 1946, to
12 remain available until expended for the purposes authorized
13 by section 3 of the Act of August 7, 1946, as amended
14 (31 U. S. C. 725s-3), in connection with the respective
15 projects from which such revenues are derived.

16 TRIBAL FUNDS

17 In addition to the tribal funds authorized to be expended
18 by existing law, there is hereby appropriated \$2,109,000
19 from tribal funds not otherwise available for expenditure for
20 the benefit of Indians and Indian tribes, including pay and
21 travel expenses of employees; care, tuition and other assist-
22 ance to Indian children attending public and private schools
23 (which may be paid in advance or from date of admission);
24 purchase of land and improvements on land, title to which
25 shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for

1 the tribe for which purchased; lease of lands and water rights;
2 compensation and expenses of attorneys and other per-
3 sons employed by Indian tribes under approved contracts;
4 pay, travel and other expenses of tribal officers, councils,
5 and committees thereof, or other tribal organizations, in-
6 cluding mileage for use of privately owned automobiles
7 and per diem in lieu of subsistence at rates established
8 administratively but not to exceed those applicable to
9 civilian employees of the Government; relief of Indians,
10 without regard to section 7 of the Act of May 27, 1930
11 (46 Stat. 391), including cash grants; and employment of a
12 recreational director for the Menominee Reservation and a
13 curator for the Osage Museum, each of whom shall be
14 appointed with the approval of the respective tribal councils
15 and without regard to the classification laws: *Provided*, That
16 in addition to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds
17 may be advanced to Indian tribes during the current fiscal
18 year for such purposes as may be designated by the gov-
19 erning body of the particular tribe involved and approved by
20 the Secretary: *Provided further*, That no part of this appro-
21 priation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water
22 rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, Washington,
23 and Wyoming, either inside or outside the boundaries of
24 existing Indian reservations.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

For carrying out the functions of the Bureau of Reclamation as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) and other Acts applicable to that Bureau, as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans; engineering and economic investigations, as a basis for legislation, and for reports thereon to Congress, relating to projects for the development and utilization of the water resources of Alaska; formulating plans and preparing designs and specifications for authorized Federal reclamation projects or parts thereof prior to appropriations for construction of such projects or parts; and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing projects; to remain available until expended, \$4,000,000, of which \$3,500,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and \$500,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River development fund: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any sums from this appropriation for investigations of any nature requested by States, municipalities, or other interests shall

1 be upon the basis of the State, municipality, or other interest
2 advancing at least 50 per centum of the estimated cost of
3 such investigations: *Provided further*, That, except as herein
4 expressly provided with respect to investigations in Alaska,
5 no part of this appropriation shall be expended in the con-
6 duct of activities which are not authorized by law.

7 CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

8 For construction and rehabilitation of authorized rec-
9 lamation projects or parts thereof (including power trans-
10 mission facilities) and for other related activities, as au-
11 thorized by law, to remain available until expended,
12 \$197,000,000, of which \$29,202,200 shall be derived from
13 the reclamation fund: *Provided*, That no part of this ap-
14 propriation shall be used to initiate the construction of trans-
15 mission facilities within those areas covered by power wheel-
16 ing service contracts which include provision for service to
17 Federal establishments and preferred customers.

18 Of the amount appropriated under the preceding para-
19 graph, \$1,000,000 is for partial liquidation of the contract
20 authority granted under the appropriation "General fund,
21 construction, Missouri River Basin", in the Interior Depart-
22 ment Appropriation Act, 1950.

23 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

24 For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects
25 or parts thereof and of other facilities, as authorized by law;

1 and for a soil and moisture conservation program on lands
2 under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant
3 to law, \$15,094,000, of which not to exceed \$12,592,900
4 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and not to ex-
5 ceed \$1,671,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River
6 dam fund: *Provided*, That funds advanced for operation
7 and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof
8 shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and
9 may be expended for the same objects and in the same
10 manner as sums appropriated herein may be expended,
11 and the unexpended balances of such advances shall be
12 credited to the appropriation for the next succeeding fiscal
13 year.

14 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

15 For necessary expenses of general administration and
16 related functions in the offices of the Commissioner of Rec-
17 lamation and in the regional offices of the Bureau of Recla-
18 mation, \$5,500,000, to be derived from the reclamation fund
19 and to be nonreimbursable pursuant to the Act of April
20 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377): *Provided*, That no part of
21 any other appropriation in this Act shall be available for
22 activities or functions budgeted for the current fiscal year
23 as general administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That
24 not exceeding \$150,000 of funds available for expenditure

1 under this appropriation shall be used for salaries and ex-
2 penses in connection with information work.

3 EMERGENCY FUND

4 For an additional amount for the emergency fund as
5 authorized by the Act of June 26, 1948 (43 U. S. C. 502),
6 \$500,000, to be derived from the Reclamation fund, special
7 fund, and to remain available until expended for the purposes
8 specified in said Act.

9 SPECIAL FUNDS

10 Sums herein referred to as being derived from the recla-
11 mation fund, the Colorado River dam fund, or the Colorado
12 River development fund, are appropriated from the special
13 funds in the Treasury created by the Act of June 17, 1902
14 (43 U. S. C. 391), the Act of December 21, 1928 (43
15 U. S. C. 617a), and the Act of July 19, 1940 (43 U. S. C.
16 618a), respectively. Such sums shall be transferred, upon
17 request of the Secretary, to be merged with and expended
18 under the heads herein specified; and the unexpended bal-
19 ances of sums transferred for expenditure under the heads
20 "Operation and maintenance" and "General administrative
21 expenses" shall revert and be credited to the special fund
22 from which derived.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for purchase of not to exceed one hundred passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed \$30,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including such services at rates for individuals not to exceed \$50 per day, when authorized by the Secretary; payment of claims for damage to or loss of property, personal injury, or death arising out of activities of the Bureau of Reclamation; payment, except as otherwise provided for, of compensation and expense of persons on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as authorized by law to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts without reimbursement or return under the reclamation laws; rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of law involving property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; performance of the functions specified under the head "Operation and Maintenance Administration", Bureau of Reclamation, in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1945; preparation and dissemination of useful information including recordings, photographs, and photographic prints; and studies of recreational uses of reservoir areas, as authorized by law: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant to the Act of

1 April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377), for expenses other than
2 those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects ex-
3 cept \$5,500,000 under the head "General Administrative
4 Expenses" and \$1,000,000 for reconnaissance, basin surveys,
5 and general engineering and research under the head
6 "General Investigations."

7 Allotments to the Missouri River Basin project from the
8 appropriation under the head "Construction and rehabilita-
9 tion" shall be available additionally for said project for those
10 functions of the Bureau of Reclamation provided for under
11 the head "General investigations" (but this authorization
12 shall not preclude use of the appropriation under said head
13 within that area), and for the continuation of investigations
14 by agencies of the Department on a general plan for the
15 development of the Missouri River Basin. Such allotments
16 may be expended through or in cooperation with State and
17 other Federal agencies, and advances to such agencies are
18 hereby authorized.

19 Sums appropriated herein which are expended in the
20 performance of functions of the Bureau of Reclamation shall
21 be reimbursable or returnable to the extent and in the manner
22 provided by law.

23 Any agency of the United States Government having
24 title thereto is authorized to transfer to the Bureau of

1 Reclamation, without reimbursement, parts, equipment and
2 supplies for aircraft excess to its needs.

3 No part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Rec-
4 lamation, contained in this Act or in any prior Act,
5 which represents amounts earned under the terms of a con-
6 tract but remaining unpaid, shall be obligated for any other
7 purpose, regardless of when such amounts are to be paid:
8 *Provided*, That the incurring of any obligation prohibited
9 by this paragraph shall be deemed a violation of section
10 665 of title 31 of the United States Code.

11 No funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation
12 for operation and maintenance, except those derived from
13 advances by water users, shall be used for the particular
14 benefit of lands (a) within the boundaries of an irrigation
15 district, (b) of any member of a water users' organization,
16 or (c) of any individual, when such district, organization,
17 or individual is in arrears for more than twelve months
18 in the payment of charges due under a contract entered
19 into with the United States pursuant to laws administered
20 by the Bureau of Reclamation.

21 Not to exceed \$1,684,000 of the appropriation herein
22 made for "Construction and rehabilitation, Bureau of Rec-
23 lamation" shall be available for expenditure toward comple-
24 tion of construction of the Coachella division of the All-
25 American Canal system, Boulder Canyon project: *Provided*,

1 That prior thereto contractual arrangements satisfactory to
2 the Secretary shall be made for repayment of sums so ex-
3 pended in excess of the amount required to be repaid under
4 the existing contract between the Coachella County Water
5 District and the United States.

6 Not to exceed 12 per centum of the construction allot-
7 ment made by the Bureau of Reclamation for any project
8 from the appropriation "Construction and Rehabilitation"
9 contained in this Act shall be available for construction
10 work by force account or on a hired-labor basis; except
11 that not to exceed \$225,000 may on approval of the Com-
12 missioner be expended for construction work by force
13 account on any one project or Missouri Basin unit when the
14 work is unsuitable for contract or when excessive bids are
15 received; and except in cases of emergencies local in char-
16 acter, so declared by the Commissioner.

17 GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

18 SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

19 For expenses necessary for the Geological Survey to
20 perform surveys, investigations, and research covering topog-
21 raphy, geology, and the mineral and water resources of the
22 United States, its Territories and possessions; classify lands
23 as to mineral character and water and power resources; give
24 engineering supervision to power permits and Federal Power

1 Commission licenses; enforce departmental regulations appli-
2 cable to oil, gas, and other mining leases, permits, licenses,
3 and operating contracts; and publish and disseminate data
4 relative to the foregoing activities; \$21,900,000, of which
5 \$3,300,000 shall be available only for cooperation with
6 States or municipalities for water resources investigations:
7 *Provided*, That the share of the Geological Survey in any
8 topographic mapping or water resources investigations car-
9 ried on in cooperation with any State or municipality shall
10 not exceed 50 per centum of the cost thereof.

11 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

12 The amount appropriated for the Geological Survey
13 shall be available for purchase of not to exceed eighty passen-
14 ger motor vehicles for replacement only; reimbursement of
15 the General Services Administration for security guard serv-
16 ice for protection of confidential files; contracting for the
17 furnishing of topographic maps and for the making of geo-
18 physical or other specialized surveys when it is administra-
19 tively determined that such procedures are in the public
20 interest; construction and maintenance of necessary buildings
21 and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands for gaging sta-
22 tions; and payment of compensation and expenses (not to
23 exceed \$10,000) of the person appointed by the President
24 to participate as the representative of the United States

1 in the administration of the compact consented to by the
 2 Act of May 31, 1949 (Public Law 82): *Provided*, That
 3 notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Presi-
 4 dent is authorized to appoint a retired officer as such repre-
 5 sentative, without prejudice to his status as a retired Army
 6 officer, and he shall receive such compensation and expenses
 7 in addition to his retired pay.

8 BUREAU OF MINES

9 CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL

10 RESOURCES

11 For expenses necessary for promoting the conservation,
 12 exploration, development, production, and utilization of min-
 13 eral resources, including fuels, in the United States, its Ter-
 14 ritories, and possessions; developing synthetics and substi-
 15 tutes; producing and distributing helium; and controlling
 16 fires in inactive coal deposits on public lands, and on private
 17 lands, with the consent of the owner; \$17,950,000:
 18 *Provided*, That the Secretary is hereby authorized and
 19 directed to make suitable arrangements with owners of
 20 private property or with a State or its subdivisions for
 21 payment of a sum equal to not less than one-half
 22 the amount of expenditure to be made for control or ex-
 23 tinguishment of fires in inactive coal deposits from funds
 24 provided under the authorization of this Act except that

1 expenditure of Federal funds for this purpose in any privately
2 owned operating coal mine shall be limited to investigation
3 and supervision.

4

HEALTH AND SAFETY

5 For expenses necessary for promotion of health and
6 safety in mines and in the minerals industries, as authorized
7 by law, \$3,790,000.

8

CONSTRUCTION

9 For construction and improvement of facilities under
10 the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Mines, to remain available
11 until expended, \$1,250,000.

12

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

13 For expenses necessary for general administration of the
14 Bureau of Mines, including such expenses in the regional
15 offices, \$1,290,000.

16

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

17 Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of
18 Mines may be expended for purchase of not to exceed one
19 hundred and thirty passenger motor vehicles for replacement
20 only; providing transportation services in isolated areas for
21 employees, student dependents of employees, and other pupils,
22 and such activities may be financed under cooperative arrange-
23 ments; temporary and emergency contracts for personal serv-
24 ices and employment of persons without regard to civil-service

1 regulations as required in the conduct of programs for the
2 control of fires in inactive coal deposits and flood prevention
3 in anthracite mines; purchase and bestowal of certificates
4 and trophies in connection with mine rescue and first-aid
5 work: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to accept
6 lands, buildings, equipment and other contributions from
7 public and private sources and to prosecute projects in coop-
8 eration with other agencies, Federal, State, or private: *Pro-*
9 *vided further*, That power produced in the operation of the
10 power plant of the Bureau of Mines at Louisiana, Missouri,
11 in excess of the Bureau's needs may be sold to non-Federal
12 purchasers, but the expenses of the Bureau in the production
13 and sale of such excess power shall not exceed the total
14 amount of such sales, and expenditures for the production
15 of excess power shall not be deemed a charge against the
16 total appropriations authorized by the Synthetic Liquid Fuels
17 Act, as amended: *Provided further*, That the sums made
18 available for the current fiscal year to the Departments of the
19 Army, Navy, and Air Force for the acquisition of helium
20 from the Bureau of Mines shall be transferred to the Bureau
21 of Mines on July 1 of said fiscal year: *Provided further*,
22 That the Bureau of Mines is authorized, during the current
23 fiscal year, to sell directly or through any Government
24 agency, including corporations, any metal or mineral product

1 that may be manufactured in pilot plants operated by the
2 Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such sales shall be
3 covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

4 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

5 MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

6 For expenses necessary for the management and pro-
7 tection of the areas and facilities administered by the
8 National Park Service, including protection of lands in
9 process of condemnation; and for plans, investigations, and
10 studies of the recreational resources (exclusive of prepara-
11 tion of detailed plans and working drawings) and archaeo-
12 logical values in river basins of the United States (except
13 the Missouri River Basin) ; \$7,735,000: *Provided*, That the
14 unexpended balance of the appropriation granted under this
15 head for the fiscal year 1951 for the "Mississippi River
16 Parkway" shall remain available during the current fiscal
17 year.

18 MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL

19 FACILITIES

20 For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance,
21 and rehabilitation of roads, trails, buildings, utilities, and
22 other physical facilities essential to the operation of areas
23 administered pursuant to law by the National Park Service,
24 \$7,300,000.

CONSTRUCTION

1
2 For construction and improvement, without regard to
3 the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended (16 U. S. C. 451),
4 of roads, trails, parkways, buildings, utilities, and other
5 physical facilities; and the acquisition of lands, interests
6 therein, improvements, and water rights; to remain avail-
7 able until expended, \$11,975,000, of which \$1,150,000 is
8 for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority
9 granted under the head "Independence National Historical
10 Park, Pennsylvania", in the Interior Department Appro-
11 priation Act, 1950, and \$3,000,000 is for liquidation of
12 obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in section
13 4 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

14
15 For expenses necessary for general administration of
16 the National Park Service, including such expenses in the
17 regional offices, \$1,284,500.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

18
19 Appropriations for the National Park Service shall be
20 available for purchase of not to exceed nineteen passenger
21 motor vehicles for replacement only; cleaning and repair
22 of uniforms for National Capital Parks police and guards;
23 and the objects and purposes specified in the Act of August
24 7, 1946 (16 U. S. C. 17j-2).

1 FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

2 MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES

3 For expenses necessary for conservation, management,
4 protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources, and
5 for the performance of other authorized functions related to
6 such resources; operation of the industrial properties within
7 the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770);
8 maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita
9 Mountains Wildlife Refuge; purchase or rent of land, and
10 functions related to wildlife management in California (16
11 U. S. C. 695-695c); and not to exceed \$30,000 for pay-
12 ment, in the discretion of the Secretary, for information or
13 evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the
14 Fish and Wildlife Service; \$6,870,000.

15 INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

16 For expenses necessary for scientific and economic
17 studies and investigations respecting conservation, manage-
18 ment, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife re-
19 sources, including related aquatic plants and products; col-
20 lection, compilation, and publication of information concern-
21 ing such studies and investigations; and the performance of
22 other functions related thereto; as authorized by law;
23 \$3,875,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources and the acquisition of lands and interests therein, including continuing the construction of fish cultural facilities on lands owned by the State of South Dakota; to remain available until expended, \$750,000.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Fish and Wildlife Service, including such expenses in the regional offices, \$882,000.

FEDERAL AID IN FISH RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 9, 1950 (Public Law 681), amounts equal to the revenues described in section 3 of said Act and credited during the next preceding fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATION OF PRIBILOF ISLANDS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of February 26, 1944, as amended (16 U. S. C. 631a-631q), amounts equal to 60 per centum of the proceeds covered into the Treasury during the next preceding fiscal year from the

1 sale of sealskins and other products, to remain available for
2 expenditure during the current and next succeeding fiscal
3 years.

4 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

5 Appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service shall
6 be available for purchase of not to exceed seventy-four pas-
7 senger motor vehicles for replacement only; purchase
8 of not to exceed six aircraft for replacement only;
9 publication and distribution of bulletins as authorized
10 by law (7 U. S. C. 417); rations or commutation
11 of rations for officers and crews of vessels at rates
12 not to exceed \$2 per man per day; repair of
13 damage to public roads within and adjacent to reserva-
14 tion areas caused by operations of the Fish and Wildlife
15 Service; options for the purchase of land at not to ex-
16 ceed \$1 for each option; facilities incident to such public
17 recreational uses on conservation areas as are not inconsistent
18 with their primary purposes; and the maintenance and im-
19 provement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities under the
20 jurisdiction of the Fish and Wildlife Service and to which
21 the United States has title, and which are utilized pursuant
22 to law in connection with management and investigation
23 of fish and wildlife resources.

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, for expenditure as authorized by law, \$7,020,000.

ALASKA PUBLIC WORKS

For an additional amount for expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 24, 1949 (Public Law 264), to remain available until June 30, 1955, \$7,000,000, of which not to exceed \$500,000 shall be available for administrative expenses.

CONSTRUCTION OF ROADS, ALASKA

For construction of roads, tramways, buildings, ferries, bridges, and trails, including surveys and plans for new road construction; acquisition of lands or interests in lands by purchase, donation, condemnation, or otherwise; to remain available until expended, \$20,000,000, of which not to exceed \$8,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF ROADS, ALASKA

For operation and maintenance of roads, tramways, buildings, ferries, bridges, and trails, \$2,600,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

1

2 The total of the amounts herein appropriated for con-
3 struction, operation and maintenance of roads in Alaska shall
4 be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein
5 made for operation and maintenance shall be available only
6 for the service of the current fiscal year.

7

8 Not to exceed 25 per centum of the amount herein
9 appropriated for construction of roads in Alaska shall be
10 available for construction work by force account, or on a
11 hired labor basis.

11

CONSTRUCTION, ALASKA RAILROAD

12

13 For the authorized work of the Alaska Railroad, includ-
14 ing improvements and new construction, to remain available
15 until expended, \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That funds appro-
16 priated under this head may be transferred to the Alaska
17 Railroad Special Fund for purposes of accounting and
18 administration.

18

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ALASKA RAILROAD

19

20 The Alaska Railroad Special Fund shall continue avail-
21 able until expended for the work authorized by law, includ-
22 ing operation of facilities under the jurisdiction of the railroad
23 in Mount McKinley National Park; operation and mainte-
24 nance of oceangoing or coastwise vessels by ownership, char-
25 ter, or arrangement with other branches of the Government

1 service, for the purpose of providing additional facilities for
 2 transportation of freight, passengers, or mail, when deemed
 3 necessary for the benefit and development of industries or
 4 travel in the area served; and payment of compensation and
 5 expenses as authorized by section 42 of the Act of Septem-
 6 ber 7, 1916 (5 U. S. C. 793), to be reimbursed as therein
 7 provided: *Provided*, That no one other than the general
 8 manager of said railroad, and one assistant general manager
 9 at not to exceed \$13,000 per annum, shall be paid an annual
 10 salary out of said fund of more than \$11,000.

11 VIRGIN ISLANDS PUBLIC WORKS

12 For an additional amount to carry out the provisions of
 13 the Act of December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 827), \$1,000,-
 14 000: *Provided*, That the estimated project costs specified
 15 in said Act of December 20, 1944, shall not constitute limita-
 16 tions on amounts that may be expended for such projects.

17 ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

18 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

19 For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary
 20 of the Interior (referred to herein as the Secretary), includ-
 21 ing teletype rentals and service; \$2,000,000.

22 GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

23 SEC. 102. Notwithstanding any provision of law to the
 24 contrary, aliens may be employed during the current fiscal

1 year in the field service of the Department for periods of
2 not more than thirty days in cases of emergency caused by
3 fire, flood, storm, act of God, or sabotage.

4 SEC. 103. Appropriations in this Act available for
5 travel expenses shall be available, for expenses of attendance
6 of officers and employees at meetings or conventions of
7 members of societies or associations concerned with the work
8 of the bureau or office for which the appropriation concerned
9 is made.

10 SEC. 104. Appropriations made in this Act shall be
11 available for expenditure or transfer (within each
12 bureau or office), with the approval of the Secre-
13 tary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement
14 or repair of buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equip-
15 ment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other
16 unavoidable causes: *Provided*, That no funds shall be made
17 available under this authority until funds specifically made
18 available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies
19 shall have been exhausted.

20 SEC. 105. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure
21 or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropria-
22 tion in this Act, in addition to the amounts included in the
23 budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression
24 or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threat-
25 ening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the In-

1 terior: *Provided*, That appropriations made in this Act for
2 fire suppression purposes shall be available for the payment
3 of obligations incurred during the preceding fiscal year.

4 SEC. 106. Appropriations made in this Act shall be
5 available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and
6 similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will
7 contribute to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations
8 shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activ-
9 ity in the same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30,
10 1932 (31 U. S. C. 686) : *Provided*, That reimbursements
11 for cost of supplies, materials and equipment, and for serv-
12 ices rendered may be credited to the appropriation current
13 at the time such reimbursements are received.

14 SEC. 107. Appropriations made in this Act shall be
15 available for services as authorized by section 15 of the
16 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) when authorized
17 by the Secretary; maintenance and operation of aircraft;
18 hire of passenger motor vehicles; examination of estimates
19 of appropriations in the field; payment for telephone service
20 in private residences in the field, when authorized under
21 regulations approved by the Secretary; and the payment
22 of dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library mem-
23 bership in societies or associations which issue publications
24 to members only or at a price to members lower than to
25 subscribers who are not members.

1 SEC. 108. The balances of all contract authorizations
2 heretofore granted to the Interior Department or any of its
3 bureaus or offices, which remain unused on June 30, 1951,
4 are hereby rescinded, except public works in the Virgin
5 Islands.

6 TITLE II—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

7 REVOLVING FUND

8 For an additional amount for the revolving fund estab-
9 lished under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation
10 Act, 1950, to provide for advances to the Virgin Islands
11 Corporation as authorized by law, \$1,800,000.

12 GRANTS

13 For payment to the Virgin Islands Corporation in the
14 form of grants, for expenses incurred during the current fiscal
15 year, as authorized by section 8 of the Virgin Islands Cor-
16 poration Act, in the conduct of activities budgeted as pre-
17 dominantly nonrevenue producing, \$130,000: *Provided*,
18 That funds appropriated under this head in the Interior
19 Department Appropriation Act, 1951, for estimated losses
20 to be sustained during the fiscal year 1951, shall remain
21 available for estimated losses to be sustained during the fiscal
22 year 1952: *Provided further*, That an amount equal to the
23 excess of grants for estimated losses for revenue producing
24 activities over the actual loss for the fiscal year 1951 and
25 the estimated loss for the fiscal year 1952 shall be trans-

1 ferred from the appropriation for "Grants" to the "Revolv-
2 ing Fund, Virgin Islands Corporation" and shall be merged
3 therewith.

4 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

5 During the current fiscal year the Virgin Islands Cor-
6 poration is hereby authorized to make such expenditures,
7 within the limits of funds available to it and in accord
8 with law, and to make such contracts and commitments
9 without regard to fiscal-year limitations as provided by
10 section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as
11 amended, as may be necessary in carrying out its programs
12 as set forth in the budget for the fiscal year 1952: *Provided,*
13 That not to exceed \$130,000 shall be available for adminis-
14 trative expenses (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the
15 Corporation, covering the categories set forth in the 1952
16 Budget estimates for such expenses.

17 TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

18 SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this
19 Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any cor-
20 poration included in this Act, shall be used for publicity
21 or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legisla-
22 tion pending before the Congress.

23 SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation or authoriza-
24 tions contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compen-
25 sation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or posi-

82^d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3790

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

MAY 3 (legislative day, MAY 2), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

as little about the subject as they did in the beginning.

The junior Senator from Louisiana has made an effort to present to the Members of the Senate his views concerning certain very vital matters. As I pointed out a few moments ago, during half the time the Senator from Louisiana has been presenting the matter, there have not been more than five or six Senators on the floor. Would not the junior Senator from Louisiana feel that he had done a ridiculous and foolish thing if, in trying to inform the Senate regarding this matter, he agreed to a limitation of debate under which, after it was all over, he might have succeeded in talking to but four or five Senators about this subject?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I may say to my good friend that on last Friday night, when there was a limitation on debate, there was a full attendance on the floor. When we have a limitation of debate, that is the time when we have a full attendance of Senators.

The Senator has mentioned Senators packing their bags. There are too many packing their bags and getting out because they think the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is going to talk and talk while they are on a vacation, and they will be having a good time over the 3d, 4th, and 5th of July while the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Arizona stay here. If we could have an agreement, we would not be talking for nothing.

Let me ask the Senator another question. He suggested a period of 30 days. Would he be willing to postpone the consideration of this bill until the 1st day of August, with the same limitation on debate?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like very much to cooperate in this matter, if we could have any reasonable basis for feeling that Senators will be present to hear the debate.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am considering the Senator's own proposition.

Mr. LONG. If we agree to a 1-day debate, there is no way to be sure that Senators will be present. If the Senator from Arizona would be willing to agree that we could debate the bill, let us say, for 3 days, starting on August 1, with a division of time between both sides, the junior Senator from Louisiana might be able to agree to that.

Mr. McFARLAND. Under those circumstances, the Senator will not have as many Senators present to hear the debate as there are today, because when we have a limitation and an agreement that we are not going to vote until a certain time, Senators do not remain. I have had charge of the division of time on several occasions, and Senators made speeches on other subjects. If we have a limitation of debate, not to exceed a certain length of time, Senators do not know whether we are going to vote in 5 minutes or within an hour, so they remain here. If we have a day's discussion I believe we shall have a good attendance, but a debate of 3 days is a different matter.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I believe that even though it is true that some Senators do not remain, more than 1 day would be necessary on such an important subject.

Mr. McFARLAND. Let me see what I can do. How about 2 days?

Mr. LONG. Speaking only for myself, and not for other Senators who may want to be heard, I should be willing to agree that, starting sometime on or after the 1st of August, we can again discuss this question.

Mr. McFARLAND. We would have to make it a certain day.

Mr. LONG. There would be at least some opportunity for Senators to be heard.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to insert in the RECORD a document which is pertinent to the pending bill?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for that purpose without losing my rights to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion about this bill. It is a highly technical and complex subject, but I want to say to the Senator from Louisiana that there are some Senators who know something about this proposed legislation, and I hope the RECORD will be clear that we have given it some study.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the summary and recommendation in the minority views, signed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and myself, who are just as violently opposed to this bill as is the Senator from Louisiana. I must say, in all fairness, that we did discuss this matter; there was a great deal of discussion. There were not many witnesses because it resolved itself into a technical legal matter. I happened to be a member of both the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, so I got a double dose. But we went into all the technicalities.

I am sure the Senator will find that in the minority views there is a great deal of discussion regarding the effects of the bill with which we agree. As the Senator has pointed out, the bill has been expanded, so that upon complaint by any independent merchant or by any citizen a cease-and-desist order could be entered which would stop a practice complained of. I am very familiar with the cement case, because it originated in my section of the country, where we were being charged too much for cement.

I think it would help the Senate to have in the RECORD the summary and recommendation of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and myself.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] be added to the minority views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

There being no objection, the summary and recommendation in the minor-

ity views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

To summarize: In confirming and in fact going beyond the Standard Oil decision, S. 719 does three things: First, it makes good faith a complete immunization to a cease-and-desist order which would terminate a discriminatory selling practice. This is true no matter what the practical consequences of the practice may be. Second, it shifts from the firm charged with a violation of law the burden of showing good faith; and it places upon the Commission the burden of showing bad faith. And finally, the bill defines "good faith" in such a way as to automatically justify violations committed to attack competitors who are not violating the law. In its effects, therefore, this bill would repeal the law against discriminatory selling and substitute in its place a law against bad faith. Having done this, it would place upon the Commission the burden of proving bad faith. But then it would write into law such an inverted definition of bad faith that the Commission could not stop predatory attack, but only self-defense against such attacks.

The whole purpose of the law against discriminatory selling is to preserve the competitive system and to increase competition. Specifically, the law against discriminatory selling is designed to prevent the large business firm from using its sheer financial power to intimidate or crush its smaller competitors. It is designed to prevent big sellers from crushing smaller competing sellers, and it is designed to prevent the big buyer from demanding and taking its supplies on unequal terms with small competing buyers and then using this advantage to squeeze out its smaller competitors. In short, the purpose of the law against discriminatory selling is to keep the door of opportunity open so that all who care to risk commercial venture may enter with the knowledge that the most efficient—and not necessarily the most powerful—will win out. A necessary collateral purpose is to give free reign to the normal competitive urge which the more efficient have for reducing prices and taking business away from the less efficient, and to the competitive necessity which the less efficient have for reducing prices to stay in business. Neither purpose could be accomplished if there were no restraints upon discriminatory selling, since the inevitable result of discriminatory selling is that the big firm—no matter how inefficient—destroys either the incentive or the ability of its smaller competitor to reduce prices. The small firms are themselves destroyed or all live on the basis of a status quo division of the market under the umbrella of high prices.

As we have already pointed out, this is a time when smaller business firms are suffering severe inequalities created by their Government. These inequalities are threatening the very existence of large numbers of small businesses.

We do not believe that big business actually needs, in addition to all its other advantages, an effective repeal of the law against discriminatory selling. We believe that big business is fully able to compete on the basis of efficiency and to survive the competitive struggle with its small competitors. There is no just excuse for giving big business the added privilege of using its aggregations of financial power to destroy its smaller competitors.

The amendment to S. 719 which has been suggested by the Federal Trade Commission meets our objections to the bill. This suggested amendment will authorize the Commission to issue a cease-and-desist order against a discriminatory practice where the Commission has shown that the effects of the particular practice, if continued, may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. The Commission's suggested amendment will, moreover, leave the

burden of proof in questions of good faith as it is under present law, and it will leave the definition of good faith open to judicial construction in accordance with established principles of law.

Accordingly, we recommend that S. 719 be so amended as to adopt the language which has been suggested by the Federal Trade Commission, and that so amended, the bill be passed. The language which has been suggested by the Federal Trade Commission is as follows:

"(b) Upon proof being made, at any hearing on a complaint under this section, that there has been discrimination in price or services or facilities furnished, the burden of rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing justification shall be upon the person charged with a violation of this section, and unless justification shall be affirmatively shown, the Commission is authorized to issue an order terminating the discrimination: *Provided, however,* That unless the effect of the discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, it shall be a complete defense for a seller to show that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor."

ESTES KEFAUVER.
WARREN G. MAGNUSON.
WILLIAM LANGER.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I withdraw my original request in order that the distinguished majority leader may ask me a question.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to propose a unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that the consideration of the pending bill, S. 719, be postponed until August 2; that on that date there be a limitation of debate, the time to be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents of the bill; the time of the proponents to be controlled by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the time of the opponents to be controlled by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]; that on August 3 the debate be limited to 4 hours, 2 hours for the proponents and 2 hours for the opponents, with a limitation of 30 minutes on each amendment or motion, including appeals, which may be offered, to be divided equally between the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator from Louisiana; and the all amendments must be germane.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator mean a limitation of 30 amendments for each side?

Mr. McFARLAND. I mean 30 minutes for both sides, 15 minutes to a side.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator make it 20 minutes?

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well, I will make it 40 minutes, 20 minutes to each side.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I believe it would be more appropriate that the time of the opponents be controlled by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. McFARLAND. I so modify my request.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, does the proposed agreement carry with it a definite hour at which the final vote shall be taken?

Mr. McFARLAND. It does not designate a definite hour, but it would mean that the bill would be disposed of at some time in the evening of Friday, the 3d of August.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent agreement is entered into. The bill will be postponed until the 2d day of August, 1951.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That the further consideration of the bill (S. 719) to establish beyond doubt that, under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor, be postponed until Thursday, August 2, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon; that on said day there shall be a limitation of debate, to be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the bill and controlled, respectively, by Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. KEFAUVER; that on Friday, August 3, 1951, debate on the bill be limited to not exceeding 4 hours, to be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents, and controlled, respectively, by the foregoing-named Senators; that debate on any amendment or motion (including appeals) shall be limited to not exceeding 40 minutes, to be equally divided between the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. KEFAUVER; and that no amendment or motion that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, may I ask my colleague when he will be ready to report the Interior Department appropriation bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. We talked it over in the committee. We can finish our work on the bill tomorrow. If there is a recess over tomorrow, I should like to ask unanimous consent to report the bill during the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. When that is done, when will the bill be considered?

Mr. McFARLAND. The appropriation bill will be made the unfinished business on Thursday, provided it is reported tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection. I want to go along with the program.

I am wondering if the attendance on Thursday is going to be anything like the attendance is today. I understand that more than 30 Senators are absent, and if the situation will be as bad or worse on Thursday, where are we going to be with the Interior Department appropriation bill? I do not want to add any more problems to the problems of the majority leader. He has enough of them, but I suggest to him that the bill is a very important one.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I hope that if Senators should have tomorrow and the 4th of July off they will be available on Thursday. There

are those of us who live quite far from Washington and we cannot go home. I feel that those who live close to Washington should be willing to come back on Thursday, and so accommodate their colleagues that we may expedite the work of the Senate and get out of here at some decent date in the fall.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it then the intention of the majority leader that on Thursday the unfinished business shall be the Interior Department appropriation bill, and that the Senate will then debate it?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Interior Department appropriation bill be made the unfinished business for Thursday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CAIN obtained the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for reconsideration of the unanimous-consent agreement that was just entered into to make the Interior Department appropriation bill the unfinished business on Thursday. It is a very important bill. I just came into the Senate Chamber, having been in the cloakroom on the telephone. While I was there the agreement was entered into. I certainly believe that that bill cannot be properly discussed on Thursday, that being the day following the Fourth of July. We have not marked up the bill. It will not be completed until tomorrow. There will be no session on Wednesday. That means that no Member of the Senate, except members of the committee, will have access to the bill until Thursday. If there is any matter that should have the full attention of the Senate it is the Interior Department appropriation bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. It was my intention that when we meet on Thursday we proceed as we did on the Independent Offices appropriation bill, that is, adopt committee amendments, with the reservation that if any Senator on the following day, or any day thereafter while the bill is under consideration, wishes to amend a committee amendment he can do so without it being necessary for him to make a motion to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment had been adopted. In other words, we could leave the amendments open to amendment without reconsideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee proposes that such action be taken, I shall be forced to object. I do not believe that is the proper way to legislate. When committee amendments have been amended, the question arises as to whether amendments that are thereafter offered to the committee amendments, and further amendments which are offered to those later amendments, are in the second or

third degree. It may be necessary to move to reconsider the vote by which a committee amendment was agreed to. I think the thing to do is to begin consideration of the bill and then consider the committee amendments in order, and if Senators desire to submit amendments to committee amendments, they be given the opportunity to do so at that time. I want to cooperate in this matter.

While I am on the floor, I will say that I raise the very question the distinguished Senator from Michigan has just raised. I pointed out to the majority leader that there are more than 30 Senators absent from the Senate today, and that we have no assurance that the situation would be any better on Thursday, the day after the Fourth of July. I do not know whether we can even obtain a quorum to consider the bill on Thursday. Those Senators who are now present are for the most part Senators who live a long way off. They are not going to be able to enjoy the vacation at home. So far as I am concerned, if there is no objection to the bill being taken up on Thursday, I shall not object. I want the Senator from Michigan to know that. It seemed that every Senator who was on the floor when the request was made wanted the bill to be taken up on Thursday, so it was agreeable to me that such action be taken.

So far as committee amendments are concerned, I feel we should not do as we did in connection with the independent offices appropriation bill. We had considerable trouble after we had adopted the amendments. The question arose as to amendments being in the second or third degree. There was a motion made to reconsider a committee amendment which had been adopted each and every time a Senator thereafter wished to offer an amendment. I do not think that is the way to proceed on an appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no request before the Senate on the subject.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am sure that my colleague [Mr. HAYDEN] is willing to continue any part of the bill that any Senator wants to have go over from Thursday until the next day.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, this discussion points up perfectly the problem of attendance on the floor of the Senate. If this continues, the Senate will become known as a Tuesday-to-Thursday Senate. We cannot induce some Members to remain on the floor on Friday, and we cannot get them back on Monday. The Fourth of July is an important holiday. I myself should like to be home on the Fourth. But even if I were at home on the Fourth of July I could and would be back here for Senate business next Thursday noon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the majority leader agree—I do not mean that we enter into a unanimous-consent agreement, but that we make an agreement for the RECORD—that any committee amendment which any Senator feels to be controversial, such as a new-start amendment, be permitted to go over, and

that a vote be had on it on Monday? Would the chairman of the subcommittee agree to that?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the usual custom.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does that mean that we will lose 2 days and go over until Monday? What is the purpose of taking up the bill on Thursday and then sit around on Thursday and Friday and do nothing? I have tried in every conceivable way to accommodate Senators with respect to their desires to meet commitments at home, but I believe Senators should be present when we begin consideration of an important appropriation bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan is going to be here on Thursday. So the Senator would not be accommodating the Senator from Michigan. The fact, however, is that the bill has not been reported. The committee worked hard all day today on the bill, and will work hard all day tomorrow on the bill. The committee met at 10 o'clock and worked hard on the bill until a quarter to five. It is an important piece of legislation. A great amount of money is carried in the bill. I am speaking for Senators who are not going to be here. The Senator from Michigan feels that a record vote should be had on these important matters. Therefore, he does not feel that Senators who have planned to go away should be placed in the position of not being able to vote on the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am not criticizing the Senator from Michigan, and I am not critical of anyone who is planning to go away. I know every Senator is answerable only to his own constituents. Far be it for the Senator from Arizona to criticize Senators who may feel it necessary not to be here. It is proposed that the bill be taken up for consideration on Thursday. But the request should not be made that we avoid voting on anything controversial on Friday. Under those circumstances, we might as well not meet on Friday. I am sure my colleague from Arizona will be able to accommodate all Senators, and to put over to Monday such amendments as Senators feel should be put over.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. My proposal is this. Will the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] assure us that with respect to highly controversial amendments they be carried over until Monday? I do not object to the bill being reported from the committee while the Senate is not in session, and I do not object to the bill being made the unfinished business for Thursday. But I believe the argument made by the Senator from Michigan has much force. Highly controversial issues, such as new starts and other issues should not be voted upon until we have a better attendance than I anticipate we will have on Thursday.

Mr. McFARLAND. We shall not have any attendance at all if we announce that we are not to do any business. I venture to suggest that if Senators know we are to do some voting on Friday, we

shall have a good attendance; but that is the only way in which we can be assured of adequate attendance.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, 5 minutes ago the Senator from Washington yielded for a question by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. That question appears to have many parts, shared by many Senators. The Senator from Washington would like to know how long the question is to continue, in order that he may resume the statement which he was about to offer to the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I understand that there is a tentative agreement that no votes will be had on Thursday.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan has talked with the Senator from Arizona, who is in charge of the bill, and he feels that there are some vital matters which could be voted upon on Monday with no loss of time.

Mr. McFARLAND. But some votes could be had on Friday.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan withdraw his request?

Mr. FERGUSON. I withdraw my request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington may proceed.

Mr. CAIN. May I inquire whether the Senator from Michigan has had a satisfactory answer to his question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan has withdrawn his request.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Chair. I was pleased to join with the majority leader in accommodating the wishes of our colleagues.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington may proceed

THE COMMUNIST TRUCE PROPOSAL

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the apparent acceptance of the truce-talk proposed by the Communist forces in Korea has been received with general jubilation by the diplomats at United Nations headquarters. Notable exceptions to this have been the representatives of the Republic of China and of the Republic of Korea. Both of these nations have long been familiar with Communist tactics and their strategic use of "armistices" and "negotiations" as instruments of conquest.

It is the hope of the junior Senator from Washington that the American people will share the experienced caution of the Chinese and Koreans rather than the wishful optimism of some of the others.

The Korean War is not over. The Korean War is far from over. The so-called truce discussions are not even scheduled for another 2 weeks.

It is this very delay, Mr. President, which should serve as a red flag of warning to our people. Never in the history of warfare has there been recorded a situation in which one belligerent power has asked its opponent to wait some 15 days before the beginning or armistice discussions. The very purpose of an armistice discussion is to bring hostilities to a standstill as quickly as possible so

as to provide a suitable atmosphere for the evolution of a peace program.

Those of us who have followed the Communist tactical and propaganda lines have long been disturbed by full-scale activity behind the iron curtain to create a so-called "international brigade" for action in Korea, in line with standard Communist practice. The world has seen such brigades in action in Spain and other areas.

The stabilization of our lines around the thirty-eighth parallel pending the beginning of truce talks will easily afford the Communists the time they need to bring their international brigade into the combat area, as well as to pour in reinforcement for the present Korean and Chinese armies. The international brigade alone is estimated by intelligence officers as numbering one-half million men, considerably greater a force than the United Nations army now deployed in Korea.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. McCARRAN. A few days ago I laid before the Senate a statement, by way of a speech, on the very subject the Senator from Washington is now discussing, the international brigade.

Mr. CAIN. I am fully aware of that fact.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have sufficient evidence to convince me that what the Senator is now saying is entirely correct, except that we do not know the magnitude of that brigade.

Let me make one further observation. The time between now and that which is suggested as the date for the discussion of an armistice will be utilized by the Reds of this country, and is being utilized now by them, for the purpose of driving fear into the hearts of the people of America and convincing them that they should yield to the armistice and yield to some peace movement the spirit of which the Reds and the Russians have no intention of carrying out. That activity is going on today in America. Every Communist in America today and every Communist cell in America today is working to drive fear into the hearts of the people of America, and to drive into their hearts a desire for peace at any price.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington shares the deep concern and suspicions which have just been expressed by the Senator from Nevada. Both Senators want to know precisely the nature and character of the purported armistice terms before we assume that a peace worthy of the name will result in Korea.

The International Brigade to which the Senator from Nevada has just made reference is estimated by intelligence officers to number half a million men, a larger force in itself than that of the United Nations presently deployed in Korea. These international "volunteers" as the Soviets call them, are trained fighting men with experience in World War II, the kind of combat-experienced soliders we had to fight in the bloody battle across Italy and France and the Pacific islands.

I know that General Ridgway and his men are not lulled into a false sense of security. They know the enemy. They know his treachery. This, Mr. President, may be the enemy's greatest treachery of all. Our forces in Korea must not now be placed into a position by the State Department which will jeopardize their lines. We already have learned of the attempt by the State Department to bind our forces at the thirty-eighth parallel on a previous occasion, thus providing the enemy with relative security of movement in preparation for another offensive. That must not happen a second time.

Part of the diplomatic elation on the truce acceptance by the Red forces is based on the assumption that there are no strings attached to the Communist offer to meet with our representative. Actually, a careful reading of the message from the Red commanders shows that this assumption is not based on fact. The reply very definitely contains a political keynote, couched in the usual language of the Kremlin.

The Communist counterproposal states that the purpose of the truce talks is to arrange for a cessation of hostilities and the establishment of peace. We know from constant reiteration in Moscow and Peiping what the term establishment of peace means. It means a settlement of all outstanding questions in accordance with the demands of Moscow.

The Communists feel that we Americans and our allies are willing to make a settlement of appeasement. The Secretary of State indicated as much on the stand before the joint Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committee. The President indicated as much on that April Nation-wide broadcast, when he sought to explain the dismissal of the Supreme Commander in the Far East and our far eastern policy in general.

The Communist radio is daily pouring out victory claims and telling Asia that the "American imperialists" are suing for peace. In fact, the parley proposal

of the Reds fixes the meeting place in territory conquered by the aggressors.

The junior Senator from Washington has seen war at first hand. I fervently hope that we shall have peace and security. But I cannot share the optimism of the diplomats over the vague consent of the Communist forces to meet with us 2 weeks hence and allow us to offer terms for an armistice. This looks like peace at any price. Americans have never taken the path of appeasement and surrender out of a war.

Nearly 150,000 American boys have been killed, maimed, or lost to the Communists in Korea. Has that sacrifice been in vain? Are we now to return to the Yalta-Potsdam program which brought on the war in the first place?

If peace can be won, I am for it. But let us not give the enemy another period of grace to build up his offensive.

It is my hope that the American people will reserve judgment and hope until we know the truce acceptance is genuine and until we know the Communist terms. Until then, we must not falter in our determination to demonstrate that force and aggression will be resisted with all possible power at the command of the United States and our allies.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as one who has been exposed to wars and who has at this very moment three members of his immediate family in uniform, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Washington and to commend him for bringing his message to the Senate of the United States.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, July 5, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 2 (legislative day of June 27), 1951:

SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

Roberto H. Todd, Jr., of Puerto Rico, to be chief justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico, vice Hon. Angel R. de Jesus, deceased.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Monroe Davis Dowling, of New York, N. Y., to be collector of internal revenue for the third district of New York, in place of James W. Johnson.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

JULY 3, 1951.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 3790]

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made:

Amount of bill passed by House..... \$496, 764, 500

Amount added by Senate (net)..... 23, 317, 807

Total of bill as reported to Senate..... 520, 082, 307

Amount of 1952 budget estimates:

Regular estimates including \$4,550,000 supplemental estimates in S. Doc. 39 and \$350,000 in H. Doc. 67..... 564, 186, 000

Amount of 1951 appropriations, as reduced by sec. 1214..... 578, 687, 825

The bill as reported to the Senate:

Under the regular and supplemental estimates for 1952..... 44, 103, 693

Under appropriations for 1951..... 58, 605, 518

BUDGET ESTIMATES, APPROPRIATIONS, AND AMOUNT RECOMMENDED
FOR LIQUIDATION OF PRIOR CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

The estimates considered by the committee total \$564,186,000. The committee recommends appropriations totaling \$520,082,307, which amount is \$23,317,807 more than recommended by the House, \$58,605,518 less than appropriations for the fiscal year 1951 after reductions under section 1214 of the general appropriation act, and \$44,103,693 less than the 1952 budget estimates.

Of the \$520,082,307 approved by the committee, a total of \$37,875,000 is for liquidation of prior contract authorizations. The bill carries no new contract authorizations for the fiscal year 1952. The bill contains a provision rescinding all contract authorizations heretofore granted remaining unobligated on June 30, 1952.

PERSONAL SERVICES

PROPOSED REDUCTIONS

Included in the 1952 Interior Department estimates for appropriations of \$559,636,000, excluding supplemental estimates totaling \$4,550,000 contained in Senate Document 39 not approved by the committee, is a total estimate of \$171,147,495 for personal services. Within the \$171,147,495 for personal services is a total of \$53,777,219 for operation and maintenance personnel, leaving an estimate of \$117,370,276 for administrative, supervisory, clerical, and other personnel not provided for operation and maintenance purposes.

With the exception of the appropriation for "Health and safety," Bureau of Mines, the committee has applied a minimum of a 10 percent reduction to the \$117,370,276 estimated for personnel other than operation and maintenance personnel. This reduction amounts to a minimum of \$11,382,399 below the budget estimates for such personnel. By virtue of the size of reductions proposed by the committee in the total appropriations requested for "Construction" and "Operation and maintenance," Southeastern Power Administration, for the Fine Arts Commission, and the elimination of the item for power and energy studies, New England and New York, the reductions in the estimates for personal services in these instances is more than a 10-percent reduction below the budget estimates, increasing to \$12,143,227 the total reductions below the 1952 budget estimates for personal services. These reductions are itemized in section 305 of the bill.

In instances where the over-all reduction by the committee in an appropriation will necessitate more than a 10 percent reduction below the budget estimate for personal services, the committee has not placed a limitation in the bill on personal services. With respect to all other appropriations in the bill involving personal services, with the exception of "Health and safety," Bureau of Mines, the committee has included in the bill a limitation on the amount of each appropriation to be available for personal services.

The committee directs that the 10 percent reduction in the estimates for personal services, excepting operation and maintenance services,

be applied to personnel in the District of Columbia and to personnel engaged in the field in the same ratio as departmental personnel and field personnel are set up in the "Detail of personal services" schedules appearing in the appendix to the 1952 budget.

Inasmuch as the Interior Department is charged with the responsibility for operating and maintaining large power and irrigation projects, transmission lines for the distribution of power from Government-owned dams, hospitals for Indians, schools for Indians, the Alaska Railroad, and national parks, which have to be operated and maintained on a 24-hour basis, the committee recommends that estimates of personnel to be engaged in the fiscal year 1952 in the operation and maintenance of such facilities be exempt from the 10 percent reduction in personal services. Administrative, supervisory, clerical, and other types of personal services estimated for such activities, however, have been reduced 10 percent. The committee recommends no reduction in the estimate for the appropriation "Health and safety," Bureau of Mines.

In effecting reductions of 10 percent or more in budget estimates for personal services, it is the expectation of the committee that these savings will be reflected administratively in proportionate reductions in expenditures which are incident to personal services.

JENSEN AMENDMENT

In view of the proposed reductions by the committee in each appropriation for personal services, the committee recommends that the following section be deleted from the bill:

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation or authorizations contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

- (a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;
- (b) to positions filled from within the agency;
- (c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;
- (d) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies and school teachers in the Indian Service;
- (e) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2;
- (f) to law enforcement officers:

Provided further, That when any department or agency covered in this Act shall, as a result of the operation of this amendment, reduce their employment to a figure not exceeding 80 per centum of the total number on their rolls as of July 1, 1951, such amendment shall cease to apply and said 80 per centum figure shall become a ceiling for employment during the fiscal year 1952 and if exceeded at any time during fiscal year 1952 this amendment shall again become operative.

ENFORCEMENT OF CONNALLY HOT OIL ACT

The 1952 budget estimate for this appropriation is \$174,000, of which \$153,300 is for personal services. The committee has applied a 10-percent reduction to the estimate for personal services, which reduction amounts to \$15,330. The appropriation recommended by the committee is \$158,670, which amount is \$21,330 less than the 1951 appropriation, \$15,330 less than the 1952 budget estimate, and likewise \$15,330 less than the \$174,000 recommended by the House.

Of the \$158,670 approved by the committee, it is recommended by the committee that not to exceed \$137,970 shall be available for personal services.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION

The committee has approved \$342,020 of the \$4,000,000 budget estimate. The \$342,020 recommended by the committee is for the following items:

(1) Roanoke River Basin:

Survey and plans for a transmission line direct
from the Buggs Island Dam to Kinston, N. C. \$23, 520

(2) Savannah River Basin:

Clark Hill-Greenwood transmission line, 115-kilo-
volt----- 318, 500

Total recommended----- 342, 020

Approximately 20 percent of the \$4,000,000 estimate was set up for personal services. In allowing the above two items for the Southeastern Power Administration, the committee has made a reduction for personal services in the first item of \$480 and \$6,500 in the second item, which in each instance represents a reduction in personal services for these two items in the same ratio as the total budget estimate for personal services has to the total budget estimate.

The committee has approved the two foregoing items with the definite understanding that the funds recommended therefor are not to be used if the Southeastern Power Administration and the public utility companies in the areas concerned can enter into wheeling agreements for the transmission of power from the Buggs Island Dam to Kinston, N. C., and for the transmission of power from the Clark Hill Dam to Greenwood, S. C.

Considerable progress has been made in the last few years in the negotiation of wheeling agreements in other areas of the United States, and the committee knows of no valid reasons why similar agreements cannot be obtained in the southeastern area of the United States.

The committee, therefore, directs the Southeastern Power Administration and the Secretary of the Interior to exhaust every possible effort to obtain proper wheeling agreements before utilizing the funds recommended for the above-mentioned facilities. It is the hope of the committee that it will not be found necessary to use these funds. In the judgment of the committee, fair and reasonable offers should be made by the public utility companies in the areas concerned for the wheeling of power from the Buggs Island and the Clark Hill Dams to preferred customers of the Government under section 5 of the 1944 Flood Control Act, and likewise in the judgment of the committee when fair and reasonable offers are made by the public utility companies such offers should be accepted by the Secretary of the Interior as the distributor of public power under section 5. As stated, very encouraging progress has been made in obtaining wheeling agreements in other areas of the United States, and the committee sincerely hopes that not only with respect to the Kinston, N. C., area and the Greenwood, S. C., area, but with respect to the entire area covered by the Southeastern Power Administration, similar progress can be reported to it in the negotiation of wheeling agreements.

BREAKDOWN OF ESTIMATE AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED

The following table sets forth the transmission facilities included in the \$4,000,000 budget estimate, the items requested by the Department to be restored to the bill, and the two items approved by the committee:

Feature (1)	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1952 (2)	Amount allowed by House (3)	Restoration requested by Depart- ment (4)	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee (5)
Roanoke River Basin:				
Buggs Island-Suffolk, 115 kilovolts.....	\$1,964,000			
Suffolk-Langley Field, 115 kilovolts.....	1,250,000			
Langley Field-V. E. P. Co. Inter.....	6,000			
Suffolk-Gatesville, 115 kilovolts.....	50,000			
Suffolk-V. E. P. Co. Inter.....	6,000			
Buggs Island-V. E. P. Co. Inter.....	3,200		\$3,200	
Buggs Island-Rocky Mount, 115 kilovolts.....	60,000		60,000	
Wilson-Rocky Mount, 115 kilovolts.....	15,000		15,000	
Goldsboro-Wilson, 115 kilovolts.....	24,000		24,000	
Goldsboro-Kinston, 115 kilovolts.....	24,000		24,000	
Buggs Island Dam to Kinston, surveys and plans.....				\$23,520
Philpott-Appalachian Inter.....	4,000		4,000	
Subtotal, Roanoke River Basin.....	3,406,200		130,200	23,520
Savannah River Basin:				
Clark Hill-Greenwood, 115 kilovolts.....	325,000		325,000	318,500
Clark Hill-Batesburg, 115 kilovolts.....	37,000		37,000	
Clark Hill-Aiken, 115 kilovolts.....	35,300		35,300	
Clark Hill-Augusta, 115 kilovolts.....	21,500			
Clark Hill-Hartsville, 230 kilovolts.....	25,000		25,000	
Clark Hill-Macon, 230 kilovolts.....	25,000			
Macon-Barnesville, 115 kilovolts.....	25,000			
Subtotal, Savannah River Basin.....	493,800		422,300	318,500
Preliminary engineering studies.....	100,000		100,000	
Total.....	4,000,000		652,500	342,020

The committee recommends that the following paragraph be added to the bill:

The sum of \$1,758,400, the unobligated portion of the \$1,850,000 appropriation contained in chapter V of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 911, Eighty-first Congress), under the heading "Department of the Interior, Southeastern Power Administration, construction", is hereby rescinded and shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this Act.

Inasmuch as the Virginia Electric Power Co. has entered into a contract with the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to furnish the additional power that will be required at Langley Field, Va., the proposed construction by the Southeastern Power Administration of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities for the transmission of power from the Buggs Island project in southern Virginia to Langley Field, Va., will not be necessary. The committee, therefore, recommends that the unobligated portion, \$1,758,400, of the appropriation of \$1,850,000 made in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, to start construction of these facilities, be rescinded. For the same reason, the Interior Department withdrew its request for additional appropriations in the fiscal year 1952 to continue these facilities, and the bill as recommended to the Senate does not contain any amount for these facilities. The elimination of further funds for these facilities is shown in the table appearing above.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The 1952 budget estimate for this appropriation is \$300,000, and the 1951 appropriation is in the amount of \$150,000.

Of the \$300,000 estimate, the House allowed an appropriation of \$275,000. The committee recommends an appropriation of \$125,000, which amount is \$25,000 less than the 1951 appropriation, \$150,000 less than the amount approved by the House, and \$175,000 less than the 1952 budget estimate.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The budget estimates provided for the purchase of not to exceed seven passenger motor vehicles. The House approved the purchase of five, and the committee recommends that the five allowed by the House be reduced to three.

CONTINUING FUND, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION AND SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

The 1952 budget estimate proposed a continuing fund of \$200,000. The House reduced this amount to \$50,000 and confined the use of this fund to "emergency expenses necessary to insure continuity of electric service and continuous operation of Government facilities in said area."

The committee recommends that the House provision be amended as indicated:

All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy under the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), generated or purchased in the southeastern power area, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, except that the Treasury shall set up and maintain from such receipts a continuing fund of \$50,000, and said fund shall be placed to the credit of the Secretary, and shall be subject to check by him to defray emergency expenses necessary to insure continuity of electric service and continuous operation of Government facilities in said area: *Provided, That the following paragraph under the heading "Office of the Secretary, continuing fund, power transmission facilities," in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950 (Public Law 350, Eighty-first Congress), is hereby amended to read as follows:*

"CONTINUING FUND

"Continuing fund, power transmission facilities: All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy under the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), generated or purchased in the southwestern power area, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, except that the Treasury shall set up and maintain from such receipts a continuing fund of \$300,000, including the sum of \$100,000 in the continuing fund established under the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944 (57 Stat. 621), which shall be transferred to the fund hereby established: and said fund of \$300,000 shall be placed to the credit of the Secretary and shall be subject to check by him to defray emergency expenses necessary to insure continuity of electric service and continuous operation of the facilities."

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION

The budget estimate is \$4,100,000, and the House allowed an appropriation of \$3,375,000. The committee recommends that this amount be decreased a net amount of \$1,060,600 under the House allowance to provide an appropriation of \$2,314,400, which amount is \$6,305,600 less than was appropriated for the fiscal year 1951, \$1,060,600 less than the House figure, and \$1,785,600 less than the 1952 budget estimate.

The appropriation of \$2,314,400 recommended by the committee is arrived at in the following manner:

(1) Amount allowed by House-----	\$3, 375, 000
(2) Less amount in 1952 estimates and included in House figure for western Missouri project-----	—1, 560, 600
Total-----	1, 814, 400
(3) Plus increase recommended by Committee for “Miscellaneous construction”-----	+500, 000
Total recommended by committee-----	2, 314, 400

The committee did not approve the requested restoration of \$50,000 for “Plans and specifications for future program.”

WESTERN MISSOURI PROJECT

The House bill included language which prohibits the use of funds for the western Missouri project, but the \$1,560,600 included in the 1952 budget estimates for this project was not taken out of the bill by the House. The committee concurs with the House that the additional funds requested for this project should not be made available and has accordingly deducted the \$1,560,600 in the 1952 estimates and included in the House figure. Inasmuch as the committee recommends that funds be denied for the continuation of the western Missouri project and has deducted \$1,560,600 for this purpose from the bill, the following language included in the bill by the House is unnecessary, and the committee recommends that it be deleted from the bill.

: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be expended for the construction of facilities designated as comprising the western Missouri project.

With respect to this request of the Southwestern Power Administration for an additional appropriation of \$1,560,600 for construction of a transmission facility between Carthage, Springfield, and Mansfield, Mo., designated as the “Western Missouri project,” it was the understanding when an appropriation for this facility was made last year that, before funds were obligated, the Secretary of the Interior should endeavor to secure a wheeling contract from the appropriate private electrical utilities. Testimony in this year’s hearing indicates that the utilities in question, and particularly the Empire District Electric Co., repeatedly offered to negotiate for a wheeling contract along the line of the so-called Oklahoma contract but that SPA had not only neglected to enter into negotiations but by letter had refused to do

so, giving as the reason a desire on the part of SPA to delay such negotiations until experience with the Oklahoma contract was available. Testimony from all witnesses also indicates that the line in question would not connect up with any SPA line but only with certain lines of a so-called supercooperative with which SPA had concluded a contract, the legality of which is now being tested in court.

In view of the unrefuted testimony before the committee, it is felt that no further action should be taken with respect to the construction of this transmission line at this time and that funds heretofore appropriated and not now obligated should not be obligated until SPA is further advised by the Congress.

It is to be hoped that SPA will proceed without delay in the negotiation of a wheeling contract with the private utilities of that area in line with the so-called Oklahoma wheeling contract.

PERSONAL SERVICES

Of the \$2,314,400 recommended for the appropriation "Construction," the committee proposes that not to exceed \$586,800 shall be available for personal services and has accordingly written such a limitation into the bill.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For this appropriation, the estimate proposed an appropriation of \$1,300,000, of which the House approved \$1,275,000.

Exclusive of operation and maintenance personnel included in the budget estimate, as distinguished from administrative and supervisory personnel, the estimate included \$442,882, for personnel services. The committee has applied a 10 percent reduction to the estimate for administrative and supervisory personnel, which amounts to a reduction of \$44,288 below the budget estimate, to provide an appropriation of \$1,255,712. This amount is \$19,288 less than the House allowance.

Of the \$1,255,712 proposed by the committee, it is recommended that not to exceed \$900,712 shall be available for personal services.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FACILITIES, DENISON DAM PROJECT

The committee recommends that the following provision be added to the bill:

The jurisdiction and control of the Denison-Payne 132-kilovolt transmission line is hereby vested in the Secretary of the Interior, and the interdepartmental accounts shall be adjusted accordingly.

The 1952 budget estimates included \$175,000 for the purchase of the Denison-Payne transmission line by the Interior Department from the Department of the Army. The committee has not included the \$175,000 in the bill but recommends the foregoing provision to vest in the Secretary of the Interior jurisdiction and control of this line. The line is excess to the needs of the Department of the Army and has been so declared, and it is needed by the Southwestern Power Administration for the delivery of electric energy from the Denison Dam to the Payne substation at which point power is delivered under contract to the Texas Power & Light Co.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The 1952 budget estimates contain provision for the purchase of 20 passenger motor vehicles, of which 8 were to be for replacement only. The House made provision for the purchase of 15, of which 8 were to be for replacement only. The committee recommends that the 15 for purchase approved by the House be reduced to 8 and the 8 shall be for replacement only.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

The estimate for this appropriation, including a supplemental estimate of \$9,000, is in the amount of \$27,000. The House approved an appropriation of \$20,000. The committee recommends that this amount be reduced to \$14,530, which is the amount available for the fiscal year 1951. The amount recommended by the committee is \$5,470 less than the House allowance and \$12,470 less than the 1952 budget estimate.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION

The 1952 budget estimate for construction is in the amount of \$73,650,000 which includes the supplemental estimate of \$4,150,000 sent to the Senate (S. Doc. 39). Of this total amount, \$21,000,000 is for liquidation of prior year contract authority. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended an appropriation of \$67,500,000 and the House allowed \$62,000,000.

The committee recommends a total of \$67,500,000 of which \$21,000,000 is for liquidation of prior year contract authority. In recommending this amount the committee has approved \$250,000 for the North Santiam Substation contained in the supplemental budget estimate and has disapproved the remainder of the supplemental estimate totaling \$3,900,000 which was requested for the purpose of accelerating the proposed California intertie. The committee recognizes the need for improving service conditions in the Redmond, Oreg., area and directs that construction of the Maupin-Madras-Redmond 230-kilovolt transmission line be expedited to the extent practicable within the limits of available funds. The committee has disapproved the budget estimate of \$54,000 covering surveys for a 230-kilovolt transmission line between LaGrande and Baker.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The 1952 budget estimate for operation and maintenance of the Bonneville Power Administration is \$5,500,000. The House allowed an appropriation of \$5,250,000.

Included in the total estimate of \$5,500,000 is \$4,115,423 for personal services, of which \$2,799,816 is for personnel engaged in operation and maintenance work. The remaining estimate for personal services, \$1,315,607, has been reduced by the committee \$131,561, or 10 percent.

The appropriation recommended by the committee is in the amount of \$5,368,439, which amount is \$118,439 more than the amount approved by the House and \$131,561 less than the 1952 budget estimate.

FLEXIBILITY IN ALLOCATING APPROPRIATIONS WITHIN THE POLICY
INTENT OF CONGRESS

Because of the business character of the Administration's activities, flexibility in allocating appropriations within the policy intent of Congress is necessary so that maximum economy can be achieved. It is recognized that the power conditions and requirements in the 2,000,000-kilowatt Federal system are constantly changing, and that facilities and operations must be adapted to actual current conditions as determined by comprehensive and continuing engineering analyses after appropriations are made. Therefore, in line with the policy stated in the committee report for last year's appropriation, the appropriations available for construction and operation of the power facilities of the Bonneville Power Administration should be administered within the appropriation language and policy intent of the Congress, on the basis of changing power conditions and requirements as they occur in the area.

It is understood that this authority for administrative adjustment in the use of funds will not permit undertaking construction of new major facilities not previously approved by the Congress. It will permit, within the limits of funds appropriated upon approval by the Bureau of the Budget, expansion of existing major facilities, construction of new minor facilities and expansion of existing minor facilities, all only as required by urgent conditions which could not have been foreseen in time for normal presentation to the Congress.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

Of the budget estimate of \$7,850,000, the House allowed an appropriation of \$6,900,000. However, on the House floor a language amendment was added to the bill earmarking a total of \$1,200,000 for soil and moisture conservation work, which had the effect of increasing this activity \$198,900 over the budget estimate of \$1,001,100 for this activity.

Exclusive of operation and maintenance personnel, and \$394,032 for operating positions under "Forestry activities" for Oregon and California lands and Coos Bay Wagon Road lands and other lands, the 1952 budget estimate includes \$3,262,954 for personal services, and the committee recommends that this amount be reduced by 10 percent, or \$326,295, which subtracted from the total budget estimate of \$7,850,000 leaves \$7,523,705. To this amount, the committee has added the \$198,900 proposed by the House bill as an additional amount to be used in the fiscal year 1952 for soil and moisture conservation work, making a total appropriation of \$7,722,605 recommended by the committee.

The amount proposed by the committee is \$822,605 more than the appropriation approved by the House and \$127,395 less than the 1952 budget estimate.

In recommending an appropriation of \$7,722,605, the committee has approved \$1,200,000 for the activity "Soil and moisture conservation" and likewise has approved \$1,775,700 for the activity "Forest management," which is the amount of the budget estimate for this activity. The committee feels justified in recommending the budget

estimate for the activity "Forest management" in view of the additional revenue that will be received by the Government from the sale of timber from the O. and C. lands in Oregon and from public-domain lands.

In proposing an appropriation of \$7,722,605, the committee recommends that not to exceed \$4,864,096 shall be available for personal services.

Since the committee is recommending in this report that \$1,200,000 be approved for the activity "Soil and moisture conservation," and is including funds in the bill for this purpose, it is recommended that the following language inserted on the House floor be deleted from the bill:

, of which \$1,200,000 shall be used for soil and moisture conservation

CONSTRUCTION

The committee recommends that the following paragraph be added to the bill, the 1952 budget estimate for this appropriation being in the amount of \$1,000,000:

Construction

For construction of access roads on the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands; acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads adjacent to such lands; to remain available until expended, \$995,000, of which not to exceed \$45,000 shall be available for personal services: Provided, That the amount appropriated herein for road construction shall be transferred to the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce.

The committee recommends \$995,000, which is the budget estimate less a 10 percent reduction in the estimate for personal services, for construction of access roads on revested Oregon and California grant lands. The House committee in its report indicated unwillingness to provide for this capital expenditure "unless and until substantial adjustments are made regarding the distribution of receipts of timber sales."

The committee is advised that the present division of receipts of 50 percent to local government and 50 percent to the Federal Government has been the policy of the Congress since 1916 when it was first established in the original Revestment Act, although in 1937 when, at the request of the Federal Government legislation was passed limiting the measurement of local participation to a percentage of receipts, provision was made for payment to the counties, after full reimbursement to the Government of all its outlays on account of the lands, of an additional 25 percent of receipts. This provision was inserted, the committee is advised, for the purpose of safeguarding the tax claims of the counties should the sales of timber not reach expected amounts. The provision would not become operative until complete reimbursement of all Federal charges against the lands. This reimbursement will be finally completed in the current year. Bills are pending in both Houses to amend the act of August 28, 1937, to provide for the original 50-50 division, that is to say, for repeal of the provision for additional payment to the counties. Upon the adoption of this legislation the operation of these lands will result in a net profit to the Government of a considerable sum each year. The committee, therefore, feels that the item for construction of access roads is an investment which will not only be repaid but will result in increased net revenue to the Government annually, as well as advance the national interest in the matter of permanent forest production on these timberlands.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

In the 1952 budget estimates authority was included for the purchase of 37 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only. The House approved the purchase of 32. The committee recommends that this number be reduced to 25.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

The House allowed the budget estimate for the several appropriations under the Bureau of Indian Affairs but placed an over-all limitation of \$65,000,000 on the funds to be available in the fiscal year 1952, which amount is \$6,425,000 less than the budget estimate of \$71,425,000.

The committee recommends that the over-all limitation be deleted from the bill and that the amount of appropriation be fixed in each individual appropriation paragraph.

In summary of the committee's action on the Bureau of Indian Affairs, it may be pointed out that the total recommended under the six separate appropriation paragraphs is \$67,907,866, which amount is \$7,567,189 less than was appropriated for these purposes in the fiscal year 1951, \$2,907,866 more than the over-all limitation of \$65,000,000 proposed by the House, and \$3,517,134 less than the 1952 budget estimates for these appropriations.

The committee concurs in the following statement contained in the House report:

Although recognizing the necessity to provide material assistance, the committee feels that increasing emphasis must be placed on active, tangible progress toward the assimilation of Indians into the general population. Unless this is done the Indians will inevitably continue in their dependent status and will never be able fully to enjoy the privileges and opportunities of American citizenship.

The committee calls this recommendation to the attention of the proper legislative committees and expresses the hope that the matters referred to therein may have the early and careful consideration of those committees.

The following discussion gives the committee action on each appropriation paragraph:

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE SERVICES

For this appropriation, the 1952 budget estimate is \$43,600,000.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$41,180,000, which is \$2,420,000 less than the estimate.

By activities, the amount proposed by the committee is broken down as follows:

(1) Hospitals, disease-preventive and curative services...	\$15, 500, 000
(2) Educational assistance, facilities and services.....	23, 000, 000
(3) Welfare and guidance services.....	1, 850, 000
(4) Placement services.....	500, 000
(5) Maintaining law and order.....	330, 000

Total recommended.....	41, 180, 000
------------------------	--------------

With reference to the activity "welfare and guidance services," the committee recommends that the Bureau of Indian Affairs concentrate on welfare work and less on guidance services.

In proposing an appropriation of \$41,180,000, the committee proposes that not to exceed \$23,699,661 shall be available for personal services. As in the case of other appropriations, the committee has exempted from the 10-percent reduction in personal services personnel engaged in operation and maintenance work.

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Included in the 1952 budget estimate of \$11,400,000 is \$4,511,404 for personal services exclusive of personnel engaged in operation and maintenance work. The committee has applied a 10 percent reduction to this personnel figure, which reduction amounts to \$451,140.

The committee has made a further reduction of \$27,500 in the subactivity for "Programing of Bureau activities" under the activity "Agricultural and industrial assistance." It is the direction of the committee that this specific reduction of \$27,500 in this item shall be in addition to the reduction in it obtained by applying the 10 percent cut below the 1952 budget estimates for personal services.

The total reduction below the budget estimate proposed by the committee is \$478,640, leaving an appropriation of \$10,921,360 recommended by the committee.

With respect to this appropriation, the committee recommends that not to exceed \$6,843,485 shall be available for personal services.

CONSTRUCTION

The 1952 budget estimate for this appropriation is in the amount of \$12,000,000, including \$3,168,963 for personal services none of which is for operation and maintenance work. The 10 percent reduction in personal services applied to this figure amounts to \$316,896, which deducted from the estimate of \$12,000,000 provides an appropriation of \$11,683,104, which amount is recommended by the committee. This amount is \$7,454,547 less than the 1951 appropriation. Of the amount approved by the committee, it is recommended that not to exceed \$2,852,067 shall be available for personal services.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The committee has applied a 10 percent reduction to the personal service estimate of \$2,992,534, which reduction amounts to \$299,253. None of the personal services provided for under this appropriation are for operation and maintenance work.

The total budget estimate under the heading "General administrative expenses" amounting to \$3,600,000 has been reduced by the committee in the amount of the \$299,253, leaving an appropriation of \$3,300,747. This amount is \$279,253 less than the 1951 appropriation. Of the \$3,300,747 proposed by the committee, it is recommended that not to exceed \$2,693,281 shall be available for personal services.

REVOLVING FUND FOR LOANS

In this instance, the committee recommends the full amount of the budget estimate, \$800,000. For the fiscal year 1951, \$2,400,000 was appropriated under this heading. The act of April 19, 1950 (Public Law 474, 81st Cong.) authorizes the appropriation of \$5,000,000 for

loans in connection with the Navajo-Hopi rehabilitation program. The committee feels that the \$800,000 included in the 1952 budget estimates for loans to continue development of business and industrial enterprises on the Navajo and Hopi Reservations should be allowed in its entirety in order to enable these tribes to assist through their own efforts in the development of their resources and the rehabilitation of their people. Funds appropriated for this purpose will be repaid to the Government.

PAYMENT TO CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW NATIONS OF INDIANS

For this appropriation, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$22,655, which amount is \$2,345 less than the budget estimate of \$25,000. The \$2,345 reduction represents a 10-percent cut in the personal services of \$23,450 included in the total estimate of \$25,000.

Out of the appropriation of \$22,655 proposed by the committee, it is recommended that not to exceed \$21,105 shall be available for personal services.

TONGUE RIVER INDIAN RESERVATION ELECTRIC LINE

A proposal involving the reimbursable transfer of the Tongue River Indian Reservation electric line to the Tongue River Electric Cooperative, Inc., Montana, was presented. The committee recognized that to incorporate such a proposal in the bill would be considered as legislation in an appropriation bill, but since it would involve no expenditure of Federal funds, but would result in an actual saving to the Government, it was agreed that the matter could best be presented as an amendment on the floor of the Senate, and authorized this be done.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The 1952 budget estimates proposed the purchase of 287 passenger motor vehicles, of which 191 were to be for replacement only.

The House made provision for the purchase of 191 passenger motor vehicles, all of which were for replacement only.

The committee recommends that the 191 approved by the House be reduced to 125, all of which shall be for replacement only.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

For the Bureau of Reclamation, the 1952 budget estimates, including a supplemental estimate of \$400,000 received by the Senate, which was disallowed, total \$252,475,000. The House approved for the Bureau appropriations totaling \$222,094,000. The committee recommends appropriations for the Bureau totaling \$234,991,247, which amount is \$36,552,753 less than was appropriated for the fiscal year 1951 after reductions were made under section 1214 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951. The amount recommended by the committee is \$17,483,753 less than the 1952 budget estimates for the Reclamation Bureau and \$12,897,247 more than the amount approved by the House.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

The budget estimate for the fiscal year 1952 is in the amount of \$5,500,000, which amount was reduced to \$4,000,000 by the House.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$4,600,000. This amount is \$600,000 more than the appropriation allowed by the House, but is \$900,000 less than the 1951 appropriation and is likewise \$900,000 less than the 1952 budget estimate.

Within the total appropriation of \$4,600,000 recommended by the committee, the Collbran project, Colorado, has been included in an amount not to exceed \$100,000, and the committee recommends that project investigations proceed on this project at the earliest possible date.

With respect to the appropriation of \$4,600,000 approved by the committee, it is recommended that not to exceed \$3,163,396 shall be available for personal services.

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For the appropriation "Construction and rehabilitation," which includes all construction work carried on by the Bureau, the 1952 budget estimates total \$224,090,000. The House allowed an appropriation totaling \$197,000,000. The committee recommends a total of \$208,344,450, which amount is \$35,388,550 less than was appropriated for the fiscal year 1951 after reductions were made under section 1214 of the General Appropriation Act, \$15,745,550 less than the 1952 budget estimates, and \$11,344,450 more than the amount approved by the House.

Out of the appropriation of \$208,344,450 approved by the committee, not to exceed \$29,160,408 is to be available for personal services. None of the personnel provided for under this appropriation is engaged in operation and maintenance work. The committee has made a 10 percent reduction in personnel estimated for under this appropriation, which reduction amounts to \$3,240,045.

BREAKDOWN BY PROJECTS

The following table sets forth a breakdown of the projects approved by the committee and the amounts therefor:

Project (1)	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1952 (2)	Amount allowed by House (3)	Amount recommended by Senate committee (4)
Alaska: Eklutna project.....	\$5,761,400	\$5,478,040	\$5,761,400
Arizona: Gila project.....	6,870,000	5,895,070	6,870,000
Arizona-California: All-American Canal.....	180,000	1,772,330	2,963,000
Arizona-California-Nevada: Colorado front work and levee system.....	2,445,000	1,901,640	2,000,000
Arizona-Nevada:			
Boulder Canyon project.....	2,900,000	2,757,370	2,900,000
Davis Dam project.....	8,072,000	7,675,000	8,072,000
California:			
Cachuma project.....	11,150,000	9,508,180	10,000,000
Central Valley project.....	38,750,000	32,204,210	33,870,000
Kern River project.....	75,000	71,310	75,000
Kings River project.....	12,000	11,410	12,000
Colorado:			
Colorado-Big Thompson project.....	19,300,000	18,065,540	19,000,000
Paonia project.....	186,000	176,850	186,000
San Luis Valley project.....	622,800	570,490	600,000
Idaho:			
Boise project, Payette division.....	154,200	146,620	154,200
Minidoka project, American Falls power division.....	1,300,000	1,236,060	0

See footnotes at end of table, p. 16.

Project (1)	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1952 (2)	Amount allowed by House (3)	Amount recommended by Senate committee (4)
Montana:			
Buffalo Rapids project, first division.....	² \$100,000	\$95,080	\$200,000
Buffalo Rapids project, second division.....	77,600	73,780	77,600
Fort Peck project.....	1,693,000	1,426,230	1,500,000
Hungry Horse project.....	22,972,000	20,918,000	22,000,000
Sun River project.....	40,400	38,410	40,400
New Mexico:			
Fort Sumner project.....	64,000	60,850	64,000
Tucumcari project.....	244,000	190,170	200,000
New Mexico-Texas: Rio Grande project.....	³ 1,088,000	1,224,660	1,288,000
Oklahoma: W. C. Austin project.....	135,000	128,360	135,000
Oregon: Deschutes project, north unit.....	313,700	285,240	300,000
Oregon-California: Klamath project.....	434,400	380,330	400,000
Utah:			
Provo River project.....	2,748,000	2,091,800	2,748,000
Washington:			
Columbia Basin project.....	27,900,000	25,672,090	27,000,000
Yakima project, Roza division.....	48,600	46,210	48,600
Wyoming:			
Eden project.....	2,000,000	1,806,550	1,900,000
Kendrick project.....	2,575,000	2,139,340	2,250,000
Riverton project.....	1,000,000	855,740	900,000
Shoshone project.....	204,300	190,170	200,000
Various:			
Missouri River Basin project.....	58,673,600	49,054,420	51,776,800
Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects.....	² 4,000,000	2,852,450	2,852,450
Total construction and rehabilitation.....	224,090,000	197,000,000	208,344,450

¹ Includes \$400,000 increase by amendment to the budget (see S. Doc. No. 39, May 17, 1951) which was not considered by the House.

² Subsequent to release of the 1952 President's budget, the Budget Bureau revised these estimates to provide \$100,000 additional funds for Buffalo Rapids, first division, under "Construction" rather than under "Rehabilitation and betterment" because of conflict with repayment arrangements.

³ Subsequent to release of the 1952 President's budget, the Budget Bureau approved an increase of \$200,000 for the Rio Grande project to \$1,288,000, which resulted from contract bids higher than anticipated for the Albuquerque substation.

ALL-AMERICAN CANAL, ARIZ.-CALIF.

The budget estimate for this project is \$180,000. The House allowed \$1,772,330, of which \$1,684,000 was earmarked for completion of construction of the Coachella division of the All-American Canal system. The committee was advised that the amount to complete the Coachella division is \$2,783,000, which amount the committee has approved because it believes that this project should be completed at the earliest possible date.

For the Imperial division of this project, the committee has approved the budget estimate, \$180,000, making a total of \$2,963,000 approved by the Committee for the All-American Canal.

With respect to the Coachella division of this project, the committee recommends that the following paragraph in the bill as passed by the House be amended as follows:

Not to exceed ~~\$1,684,000~~ *\$2,783,000* of the appropriation herein made for "Construction and rehabilitation, Bureau of Reclamation" shall be ~~available for expenditure toward~~ *expended for* completion of construction of the Coachella division of the All-American Canal system, Boulder Canyon project: *Provided*, That ~~prior thereto contractual arrangements satisfactory to the Secretary shall be made for repayment of any sums thereof~~ *so expended in excess of the amount required to be repaid under the existing contract between the Coachella Valley, County Water District and the United States shall be repayable by said district to the United States unless said district shall be judicially determined to be not liable therefor.*

It is to the interest of the Government that this matter be judicially determined at the earliest possible moment, and the committee feels that the Secretary of the Interior should be as diligent as the district in prosecuting such action. The committee also feels that completion of the project should be diligently pursued so that the project can be completed at the earliest possible date and the final costs thereof determined.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

The 1952 budget estimate for this project is \$38,750,000, including a supplemental estimate of \$400,000 in Senate Document 39, which supplemental estimate has been denied by the committee.

The committee has approved an appropriation for this project in the amount of \$33,870,000, which is the same amount as recommended by the House Appropriations Committee. The \$33,870,000 proposed by the committee is \$4,480,000 less than the regular 1952 budget estimate, \$38,350,000, and \$4,880,000 less than the total estimate including the \$400,000 supplemental.

In recommending an appropriation of \$33,870,000, the committee has specifically denied funds for the following items contained in the estimates of the 1952 program:

(1) Transmission facilities:

	<i>1952 estimate</i>
(a) Keswick-Tracy via Elverta 115-kilovolt line	\$1, 400, 000
(b) Port Chicago-Mare Island 115-kilovolt line and 2 substations	300, 000
(c) Tracy-Patterson-Naval Supply 69-kilovolt line and 2 substations	450, 000
(d) CVP-BPA interconnection and substation, 230-kilovolt, including \$400,000 contained in S. Doc. 39	2, 100, 000
(e) Tracy-Livermore-Ames Laboratory line and substation	700, 000
(f) Tracy-Contra Costa-Clayton-Ygnacio 69- kilovolt line and 2 substations	201, 170
(g) Keswick-Shasta Dam area PUD 115-kilovolt line and substation	105, 308
(h) Elverta-Sacramento switchyard	150, 000
(i) Folsom-Elverta-Sacramento loop 115-kilo- volt line and substation	500, 000

Total disallowed by committee for fore- going items	5, 906, 478
--	-------------

The total reduction of \$5,906,478 for the foregoing items is more than the over-all reduction recommended by the committee for the Central Valley project. It is the direction of the committee that the additional funds that would be available after elimination of the foregoing specific items be applied to the irrigation features of the Central Valley project in order that those features may be expedited as much as possible.

The committee has restored \$630,000 of the Central Valley project estimate specifically for initiation of construction of the Contra Costa County water district distribution system only. None of these

funds, nor any others in the bill, or previously appropriated, are to be used for surveys, or any other work in connection with the proposed aqueduct or other water service to the city of Richmond. The committee feels the issues between the city of Richmond and the East Bay municipal utility district should be settled between these agencies before the Bureau of Reclamation proceeds further with negotiations or plans to serve the city of Richmond with municipal or industrial water supplies. If satisfactory agreements cannot be reached, the committee next year will take another look at the problem.

With specific reference to the proposed Folsom-Elverta-Sacramento loop 115-kilovolt line and substation, the committee wishes to point out in view of the fact that it has been estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation witnesses that power from Folsom Dam will not be available until 1954 that it feels, in recognition of the demand upon the Federal Treasury for national defense purposes, this item can be postponed this year. The committee believes that the Bureau of Reclamation should conduct an investigation to determine whether it would be preferable to construct a 230-kilovolt line from Folsom Dam to connect to the Shasta-Tracy line, rather than the 115-kilovolt line which the Bureau has proposed. This report should be available prior to the submission of a request for any additional funds on this item in a subsequent appropriation bill.

COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT, COLORADO

The committee recommends \$19,000,000 for this project in lieu of the budget estimate of \$19,300,000.

The committee has disallowed the \$100,000 included in the 1952 budget estimates for the Estes-Leyner 115-kilovolt transmission line but has approved for inclusion in the Bureau's 1952 program for this project the Estes power plant-Pole Hill power plant 115-kilovolt line in the amount of \$100,000. This latter item was recommended to the committee by both the Reclamation Bureau and the public utility company in the area.

MINIDOKA PROJECT, AMERICAN FALLS POWER DIVISION, IDAHO

The House approved \$1,236,060 of the budget estimate of \$1,300,000 for this project. The committee recommends that the project be eliminated and has disallowed the \$1,300,000 budget estimate, which was broken down as follows:

	Estimated cost	1952 budget estimate
(1) American Falls power plant.....	\$5,390,000	\$1,067,000
(2) American Falls switchyard.....	540,000	133,000
(3) Transmission line (American Falls-Minidoka Dam).....	670,000	100,000
Total.....	6,600,000	1,300,000

MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT, NEW MEXICO

Because of the severe drought in the Middle Rio Grande Valley, the committee recommends that the emergency work on the Middle Rio Grande project, New Mexico, be undertaken immediately for the purposes outlined in the President's letter of May 23, 1951, to the Secretary of the Interior. The committee further recommends that the funds for this purpose should be made available by the Secretary of the Interior from unobligated balances currently available to the Bureau of Reclamation in its appropriation accounts for "Construction and rehabilitation."

Because of the emergency situation existing in this area, the Bureau of the Budget on May 24, 1951, released \$135,000 of impounded Reclamation Bureau investigation funds to be used in expediting the advance planning for the emergency phases of this project. The committee believes that the emergency work on this project should be carried forward as rapidly as possible. The committee was advised that approximately \$1,463,000 will be required for this emergency construction.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

For the Missouri River Basin project, the 1952 budget estimate is \$58,673,600. The House allowed an appropriation of \$49,054,420.

The committee recommends a total of \$51,776,800 for the Missouri River Basin, which amount is \$6,896,800 less than the 1952 budget estimates, \$2,722,380 more than the amount approved by the House, and \$23,946,276 less than was appropriated for the Missouri River Basin project for the fiscal year 1951 after reductions were made under section 1214 of the General Appropriation Act.

The \$51,776,800 recommended by the committee is arrived at in the following manner:

(1) Amount approved by House Committee on Appropriations.....	\$51, 591, 800
(2) Plus increase specifically earmarked under phase B for Rapid Valley unit.....	185, 000
Total recommended by committee.....	51, 776, 800

BREAKDOWN OF PROJECTS

The following table sets forth a breakdown of the projects approved by the committee and the amounts therefor:

Project, divisions, and units (1)	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1952 (2)	Amount allowed by House (3)	Amount recommended by Senate committee (4)
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT			
Phase A—Units ready for or under construction:			
Bostwick division, Nebraska-Kansas.....	\$1,982,300	\$1,806,550	\$1,900,000
Boysen division, Wyoming, Boysen unit.....	1,958,060	1,806,550	1,900,000
Cheyenne division, Wyoming-South Dakota:			
Angostura unit.....	1,261,900	1,140,950	1,200,000
Keyhole unit.....	1,282,700	1,219,610	1,282,700
Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska.....	8,400,018	7,606,550	8,000,000
Grand division, South Dakota, Shadell unit.....	506,000	475,410	500,000
Heart division, North Dakota:			
Dickinson unit.....	11,000	10,460	11,000
Heart Butte unit.....	509,000	475,410	500,000
Helena-Great Falls division, Montana, Canyon Ferry unit.....	8,078,000	7,606,550	8,000,000
North Dakota pumping division, North Dakota, Fort Clark unit.....	102,000	95,080	100,000
Oregon Trail division, Wyoming:			
Glendo unit.....	309,000	261,480	275,000
Smoky Hill division, Kansas, Cedar Bluff unit.....	1,310,141	475,410	500,000
South Platte division, Colorado, Narrows unit.....	75,000	47,540	50,000
Three Forks division, Montana, Crow Creek unit.....	109,000	95,080	100,000
Transmission division.....	18,709,640	14,227,380	14,963,300
Upper Republican division, Colorado-Kansas, St. Francis unit.....	334,141	127,410	134,000
Yellowstone division, Montana-North Dakota:			
Cartwright unit.....	33,800	32,140	33,800
Sadie Flat unit.....	581,900	522,950	550,000
Sidney unit.....	521,000	475,410	500,000
Subtotal, phase A.....	46,056,600	38,507,950	40,499,800
Phase B—Units being prepared for construction:			
Big Horn Basin division, Wyoming:			
Big Horn No. 2 unit.....	15,000		
Big Horn No. 3 unit.....	14,000		
Bluff unit.....	10,000		
Hanover unit.....	15,000		
Paintrock unit.....	20,000		
Shell Creek unit.....	26,000		
Shoshone extension unit.....	250,000		
Cheyenne division, Wyoming-South Dakota, Rapid Valley unit.....	200,000		
Helena-Great Falls division, Montana, Helena Valley unit.....	50,000		
James division, South Dakota, Oahe unit.....	839,000		
Jefferson division, Montana, East Bench unit.....	140,000		
Lower Big Horn division, Montana-Wyoming, Hardin unit.....	300,000		
Middle Loup division, Nebraska:			
Farwell unit.....	368,600		
Sargent unit.....	131,400		
Missouri-Souris division, Montana-North Dakota: Crosby-Mohall unit.....	654,000		
Montana pumping division, Montana:			
Charley Creek unit.....	20,000		
Nickwall unit.....	14,000		
Powder division, Montana-Wyoming:			
Kaycee unit.....	67,000		
Moorhead unit.....	78,000		
Piney unit.....	75,000		
Solomon division, Kansas-Kirwin unit.....	125,000		
Yellowstone division, Montana-North Dakota:			
Colgate unit.....	20,000		
Elm Coulee unit.....	18,000		
Seven Sisters unit.....	25,000		
Stipek unit.....	50,000		
Subtotal, phase B.....	3,525,000	2,852,450	3,185,000

Project, divisions, and units (1)	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1952 (2)	Amount allowed by House (3)	Amount recommended by Senate committee (4)
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT—continued			
Phase C—Continuing work on the general plan of development.....	\$3,500,000	\$2,852,450	\$3,000,000
Phase D—Work in connection or in cooperation with Corps of Engineers.....	92,000	87,480	92,000
Other Department of Interior agencies.....			
Bureau of Land Management.....	350,000	309,020	325,000
Bureau of Mines.....	200,000	142,620	150,000
Fish and Wildlife Service.....	450,000	380,330	400,000
Geological Survey.....	3,800,000	3,327,860	3,500,000
National Park Service.....	350,000	285,240	300,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	350,000	309,020	325,000
Subtotal, other Department agencies.....	5,500,000	4,754,090	5,000,000
Total.....	58,673,600	49,054,420	51,776,800

TRANSMISSION DIVISION

The budget estimate for the "Transmission division," Missouri River Basin project, is \$18,709,640. The committee has approved for the transmission division \$14,963,300, or an amount \$3,746,340 less than the budget estimate.

In allowing an appropriation of \$14,963,300, the committee has made the following specific reductions, which is in accord with the action taken by the House Appropriations Committee:

	1952 Amount
(1) Canyon Ferry-Great Falls 115-kilovolt line and substation.....	\$753,450
(2) Canyon Ferry-Three Forks-Anaconda 115-kilovolt lines and substations.....	703,000
(3) Miles City-Yellowtail 115-kilovolt lines and substations.....	85,000
(4) Yellowtail-Billings 115-kilovolt lines and substations..	810,000
(5) Sioux City-Omaha line.....	207,463
(6) Omaha substation.....	70,242
(7) Sioux City-Storm Lake line.....	118,428
(8) Storm Lake-Denison-Holland-Omaha line.....	30,624
(9) Sioux City-Sibley line.....	467,643
(10) Additional reduction.....	500,490

Total reductions under budget estimate recommended..... 3,746,340

Items 1 to 9, inclusive, above, eliminate from the 1952 program specific items. With respect to item 10 above, "Additional reduction," this is a general reduction in the transmission division and is not to eliminate any specific project items.

BOSTWICK DIVISION, NEBRASKA-KANSAS

FRANKLIN CANAL

The committee concurs fully with the position taken by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives that the Franklin canal unit is an integral and essential part of the Bostwick division of the Missouri Basin project. Therefore, it is directed that

the Bureau of Reclamation proceed with construction on the Franklin unit by the reprogramming of available funds heretofore appropriated and allocated to the Bostwick division.

CHEYENNE DIVISION, WYOMING-SOUTH DAKOTA, RAPID VALLEY UNIT

The Rapid Valley unit of the Cheyenne division, Wyoming-South Dakota, is under phase B (advance planning) and is included in the Bureau's 1952 program. To the over-all figure recommended by the committee for the Missouri River Basin, the committee has added \$185,000, which amount is earmarked for further advance planning on this project.

The Rapid City Air Force Base is east of Rapid City, S. Dak., and will be in need of an additional water supply. The committee was advised that the Air Force in lieu of digging additional wells would prefer to get water by gravity mains from Rapid City. The committee was further advised that the city can supply water from its present sources for about 3 to 5 years but that neither the city nor the Air Force would feel safe in contracting on this basis unless there is a reasonable prospect that the second reservoir in the Rapid Valley project, the Pactola Reservoir, is built. The committee feels that this project should go forward as rapidly as possible in order to provide an additional water supply for the Air Force base near Rapid City, as well as for the other purposes for which the project is planned, and has specifically included \$185,000 in the bill to continue the planning on the project in order that it may be made ready for moving into the construction phase. When the planning has advanced to such a stage as to permit, and if the reports are favorable, the Congress should be advised by the Reclamation Bureau and a budget estimate submitted to start construction on this project. In the absence of being able to obtain water from Rapid City, the committee was advised that the Air Force base will need four or five additional wells at an additional cost of approximately \$1,000,000. The committee is appropriating for the Rapid Valley project with the definite understanding that this additional \$1,000,000 will not be spent by the Air Force to obtain an additional water supply.

GLENDON AND MOORHEAD PROJECTS

The committee recommends that the following provisos contained in the 1951 Interior Department Appropriation Act be included in the bill for the fiscal year 1952:

: Provided further, That in order to promote agreement among the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado and to avoid any possible alteration of existing vested water rights, no part of this or of any prior appropriation shall be used for construction or for further commitment for construction of the Glendo unit or any feature thereof, until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado, and approved by Congress: Provided further, That no part of this or prior appropriations shall be used for construction, nor for further commitments to construction of Moorhead Dam and Reservoir, Montana, or any feature thereof until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of Wyoming and Montana, and approved by the Congress.

KEATING AMENDMENT

The committee recommends that the following proviso included in the bill on the floor of the House be deleted:

: Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling

service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers

and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof:

: Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities which the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer

The committee is of the opinion that the Keating amendment as passed by the House is too restrictive as applied within certain areas. Therefore, the committee has agreed to a substitute amendment which contains modifications providing for flexibility in application and clarity in interpretation.

The modified amendment was adopted unanimously by the committee in order to implement the policy of Congress that, within those areas where wheeling-service contracts have been executed, use will be made of transmission facilities of the wheeling agencies wherever possible to avoid duplication and, at the same time, to provide for the integration of Federal projects and to provide an adequate and dependable supply of power to rural electric cooperatives, Federal establishments, and other preferred customers. The maximum utilization of the facilities of others, rather than the construction of Government transmission facilities, will result in the savings of Federal funds and critical materials needed for the defense effort.

The committee urges that the private utilities make every effort to bring about the transmission of electric energy at low rates to all customers who are entitled to preference in the use of power generated by Government facilities, and who are without transmission facilities.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For "Operation and maintenance" of existing projects, the budget estimate is \$16,385,000. The House approved an appropriation of \$15,094,000.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$16,168,594, of which not to exceed \$10,331,434 shall be available for personal services.

Included in the total estimate of \$16,385,000 is \$10,447,840 for personal services. Of the \$10,447,840 for personal services, \$9,283,794 is for personnel engaged in operation and maintenance of existing irrigation and power projects. The remaining \$1,164,046 for administrative, supervisory and clerical personnel has been reduced by the committee by 10 percent or in the amount of \$116,406.

PALO VERDE WEIR

With respect to the funds available for maintenance of the Palo Verde temporary rock weir, the committee wishes to state that such funds are to be available for the regular maintenance and not merely for "emergency" maintenance.

ALL-AMERICAN CANAL

The committee has approved the inclusion in the total appropriation from the Colorado River dam fund, Bureau of Reclamation,

\$191,000 to continue operation and maintenance during construction of Imperial Dam and the All-American Canal including Pilot Knob check and wasteway with the understanding that the use of said funds for this purpose is to be for this one fiscal year pending a determination of the effect of the Mexican Water Treaty of 1944 on the existing repayment contract of December 1, 1932, between the United States and the Imperial irrigation district.

The committee recommends that the Secretary of the Interior enlist the aid of the Department of Justice in promptly exploring the possibility of a contract between Imperial irrigation district and the United States to the end that a mutually satisfactory determination may be agreed upon and that the Imperial irrigation district also promptly join in this endeavor.

The appropriation of funds for operation and maintenance during construction of Imperial Dam and the All-American Canal shall not be considered prejudicial to the interest of the United States or Imperial irrigation district.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Of the \$6,000,000 budget estimate, the House allowed an appropriation of \$5,500,000. Included in the \$6,000,000 estimate is \$5,217,975 for personal services, none of which is for operation and maintenance work. The committee has applied a 10 percent reduction to the \$5,217,975 for personal services, which reduction amounts to \$521,797. Deducting this reduction of \$521,797 from the total budget estimate of \$6,000,000 leaves \$5,478,203, which is the amount of the appropriation approved by the committee.

The \$5,478,203 recommended by the committee is \$521,797 less than the 1952 budget estimate, \$21,797 less than the amount approved by the House, and \$1,385,797 less than was appropriated for the fiscal year 1951.

The limitation recommended by the committee on personal services under this appropriation is not to exceed \$4,696,178.

EMERGENCY FUND

The 1952 budget estimate for the "Emergency Fund" is \$500,000. The committee recommends that this amount be reduced by \$100,000 to provide an appropriation of \$400,000.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FACILITIES, FORT PECK PROJECT, MONTANA

The committee recommends that the following paragraph be added to the bill, which is contained in the 1952 budget estimates:

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FACILITIES, FORT PECK PROJECT, MONTANA

The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to transfer to the Department of the Interior without exchange of funds, all of the right, title, and interest of the Department of the Army in and to the following facilities, including rights-of-way (except that portion of the rights-of-way within the Fort Peck Reservoir area), but there shall be reserved the right to use the power facilities for the purpose of transmitting power to the Fort Peck project during emergency periods when the Fort Peck power plant is not functioning: (a) the Fort Peck-Rainbow (Great Falls) 161-kilovolt transmission line; (b) the Rainbow (Great Falls) terminal facilities; and (c) the Fort Peck-Whitley 50-kilovolt transmission line and substation.

The Fort Peck-Rainbow, 161-kilovolt transmission line, the Rainbow terminal facilities, and the Fort Peck-Whitley 50-kilovolt line and

substation are integral parts of the Fort Peck transmission network and are operated and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation for the sale of surplus power from the Fort Peck power plant. The amendment recommended by the committee proposes that the rights to these facilities be transferred from the Corps of Engineers to the Reclamation Bureau, reserving in the Corps of Engineers the right to use the power facilities for the purpose of transmitting power to the Fort Peck project during emergency periods when the Fort Peck power plant is not functioning. This transfer of facilities as set forth in the above amendment has been agreed to by the Corps of Engineers.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

HIRING OF CONSULTANTS

The committee recommends that the following language in the bill be amended as indicated:

not to exceed ~~\$20,000~~ \$50,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including such services at rates for individuals not to exceed ~~\$50~~ \$100 per day, when authorized by the Secretary;

The 1952 budget estimate proposed no limitation on the over-all amount to be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946. For the fiscal year 1951, the law carried a limitation of \$100,000 on this type of employment. For the fiscal year 1952, the House committee proposed a limitation of \$60,000, which amount was reduced to \$30,000 on the House floor. The committee recommends that the limitation be increased to \$50,000, which amount is \$50,000 less than the 1951 limitation.

With respect to the ceiling of \$100 per day for individual consultants, which is the ceiling in the 1951 Interior Department Appropriation Act, and which is included in the 1952 budget estimates, the figure was approved by the House Appropriations Committee but was reduced on the House floor to \$50 per day. The committee recommends that the maximum per diem rate be increased from \$50 to \$100. A report is made to the committee each year of the personnel employed at the rate of \$100 per day, the names of the individuals employed, and the number of days each was employed. The committee has not found that the right to employ consultants at the rate of \$100 per day has been abused by the Reclamation Bureau. It is important to the work of the Bureau to be in position to obtain when necessary outstanding and competent engineering consultants on problems arising in connection with the construction of large dams and irrigation works. The Congress has also recognized this need in connection with construction projects under the Corps of Engineers and with respect to flood control and rivers and harbors projects permits the Corps of Engineers to employ consultants at not to exceed \$100 per day.

ARCHEOLOGICAL STUDIES

The committee recommends that the following language in the bill be amended as indicated:

and studies of recreational uses of reservoir areas, ~~as authorized by law and investigation and recovery of archeological and paleontological remains in such areas in the same manner as provided for in the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 461-467)~~

Needed archeological work in areas to be flooded by reservoirs has to be carried out prior to the completion of a dam and the filling of the reservoir, and the committee feels that the above change recommended by the budget estimates in the appropriation language of the Reclamation Bureau should be made in order to remove any doubt as to the authority of the Bureau to use funds for this work. The committee was advised that not in excess of \$100,000 would be spent in any one year for this type of work.

EXPENSES OTHER THAN THOSE INCURRED ON BEHALF OF SPECIFIC RECLAMATION PROJECTS

The committee recommends that the following proviso in the bill be amended as indicated:

: Provided, That no part of any appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377), for expenses other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects except ~~\$5,500,000 under the head "General Administrative Expenses"~~ and ~~\$1,000,000~~ *amounts provided for reconnaissance, basin surveys, and general engineering and research under the head "General investigations."*

The limitations recommended by the committee to be deleted are not contained in the 1952 budget estimates, and the committee does not feel that such limitations are necessary. The committee has recommended reductions below the budget estimates in the appropriations for "General administrative expenses" and "General investigations", and it does not believe that the additional control accounts and bookkeeping that would be required by the above-noted limitations would justify these limitations.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

Of the budget estimate of \$22,900,000, the House allowed an appropriation of \$21,900,000. The committee recommends that this amount be reduced to \$21,300,000, which amount is \$600,000 less than the appropriation approved by the House and \$1,600,000 less than the 1952 budget estimate.

Of the appropriation of \$21,300,000 proposed by the committee, it is recommended that not to exceed \$13,455,000 shall be available for personal services, which limitation represents a 10 percent reduction in the 1952 budget estimate for personal services.

BUREAU OF MINES

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES

The budget estimate for this appropriation is \$18,700,000, of which amount the House allowed \$17,950,000.

Included in the \$18,700,000 total estimate is \$11,751,972 for personal services, of which \$624,000 is for operation and maintenance work. The remaining personal service estimate amounts to \$11,127,972, to which the committee has applied a 10 percent reduction, amounting to \$1,112,797 below the budget estimate.

Deducting the \$1,112,797 from the budget estimate leaves \$17,587,203, which amount is recommended by the committee for

the fiscal year 1952. This amount is \$362,797 less than the appropriation approved by the House, and, as indicated, \$1,112,797 less than the 1952 budget estimate.

With respect to this appropriation, the committee proposes a personal service limitation in an amount not to exceed \$10,639,175.

No part of the supplemental estimate of \$750,000 for operation of the proposed plant at Laramie, Wyo., was approved inasmuch as this plant is not now in operation and will not be during the fiscal year 1952.

HEALTH AND SAFETY

The committee has approved the budget estimate, \$3,790,000, for this appropriation, which amount was also allowed by the House.

Inasmuch as this appropriation is used in connection with coal mine inspection and other health and safety work in the interest of those working in the mines, the committee has made no reduction in this appropriation, and likewise recommends no reduction in the amount of this appropriation to be available for personal services. Under the object classification of this appropriation, \$3,092,862 out of the total estimate of \$3,700,000 is estimated for personal services.

CONSTRUCTION

For this appropriation, the committee recommends a total of \$1,587,412, which amount is \$12,588 less than the total budget estimate of \$1,600,000, including a supplemental estimate of \$350,000 in House Document 67. The reduction of \$12,588 recommended by the committee is a 10 percent reduction in personal services. The amount recommended by the committee represents a net increase of \$337,412 over the appropriation of \$1,250,000 approved by the House inasmuch as the House did not consider on this bill the supplemental estimate of \$350,000 for completion of the pilot plant started during World War II at Laramie, Wyo., for research on the production of alumina from low-grade ores, which has been approved by the committee.

The committee recommends a personal-service limitation of not to exceed \$113,287.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The committee has applied a 10 percent reduction to personal services in this appropriation, which amounts to a reduction of \$113,159 below the 1952 budget estimate, and also a reduction below the House in the same amount inasmuch as the budget estimate had been approved by the House.

The appropriation recommended by the committee is \$1,176,841 as compared to the budget estimate and House figure of \$1,290,000. Of the \$1,176,841 allowed by the committee, it is recommended that not to exceed \$1,018,434 shall be available for personal services.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

Of the \$8,176,000 budget estimate, the House allowed an appropriation of \$7,735,000, which amount is recommended by the committee.

The committee directs that obligations and expenditures of this appropriation of \$7,735,000 shall follow substantially the breakdown by activities furnished the committee by the National Park Service. It is also the direction of the committee that preliminary work for new projects be postponed.

In proposing an appropriation of \$7,735,000, the committee recommends that not to exceed \$6,584,342 shall be available for personal services, which limitation represents a 10 percent reduction in the 1952 budget estimate for personal services, excepting operation and maintenance personnel.

The \$7,735,000 recommended by the committee is \$441,000 less than the 1952 budget estimate.

MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

The committee recommends for this appropriation \$7,369,790, which amount is \$69,790 more than allowed by the House and \$26,710 less than the budget estimate.

The reduction of \$26,710 recommended by the committee represents a 10-percent reduction in personal services with the exception of operation and maintenance personnel.

Of the \$7,369,790, not to exceed \$4,193,747 is to be available for personal services.

CONSTRUCTION

The House allowed the budget estimate of \$11,975,000, which the committee recommends be reduced to \$11,370,000. This amount is \$5,097,000 less than the 1951 appropriation and \$605,000 less than the 1952 budget estimate. Of the amount proposed by the committee, \$4,150,000 is for the liquidation of prior contract authority.

In recommending an appropriation of \$11,370,000, the committee proposes that not to exceed \$945,000 shall be available for personal services. This is a 10 percent reduction in the 1952 estimate for personal services.

In addition to a reduction of \$105,000 for personal services, the committee has denied \$500,000 requested for new projects under the activity "Roads and trails."

With respect to the \$90,000 in the 1952 budget estimates for acquisition of the Old Stone House in Georgetown, the committee recommends that if the Department proceeds with its proposal to acquire this property it should institute condemnation proceedings.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The House allowed the budget estimate, \$1,284,500, for this appropriation. None of the personnel provided for under this appropriation is engaged in operation and maintenance work. The committee has made a 10-percent reduction in all personal services under this appropriation, which amounts to a reduction of \$112,726 under the budget estimate. The appropriation recommended by the committee is \$1,171,774, of which not to exceed \$1,014,538 is to be available for personal services.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES

The House allowed the budget estimate, \$6,870,000, and the committee recommends an appropriation of \$6,606,558, of which not to exceed \$4,259,363 shall be available for personal services, which limitation represents a 10 percent reduction in the 1952 budget estimates for personal services, excepting operation and maintenance personnel.

The committee has not approved the amount of \$263,442 contained in the 1952 budget estimate for "River basin studies."

INVESTIGATION OF RESOURCES

The budget estimate for this appropriation is \$4,046,000, of which the House approved \$3,875,000.

The committee has made a 10-percent reduction below the estimate in personal services included in this appropriation, excepting personnel engaged in operation and maintenance work, which reduction amounts to \$187,014. The appropriation of \$3,858,986 is \$16,014 less than the amount approved by the House and \$187,014 less than the 1952 budget estimate.

Of the \$3,858,986 recommended by the committee, not to exceed \$2,487,629 is to be available for personal services.

The committee recommends that the following proviso be added to the bill:

: Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for investigations, surveys, studies, trapping or similar work in foreign countries.

CONSTRUCTION

The budget estimate for this appropriation is \$750,000, which amount was allowed by the House.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$733,742, which is \$16,258 less than the budget estimate and represents a 10-percent reduction in personal services. None of the personnel estimated for under this appropriation is engaged in operation and maintenance work.

Of the \$733,742 proposed by the committee, not to exceed \$146,324 is to be available for personal services.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The budget estimate of \$882,000 was approved by the House, and the committee recommends that this amount be reduced by \$75,369, which represents a 10-percent reduction in personal services. None of the personnel provided for under this appropriation is engaged in operation and maintenance work.

Of the \$806,631 approved by the committee, not to exceed \$678,319 is to be available for personal services.

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

The budget estimate for this appropriation is \$9,100,000. The \$7,020,000 allowed by the House has been approved by the committee. This amount is \$2,080,000 less than the budget estimate. Of the \$7,020,000 recommended by the committee, not to exceed \$811,865 is to be available for personal services.

With respect to this appropriation, the committee recommends that the following language included in the bill by the House be deleted:

For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, for expenditure as authorized by law, \$7,020,000.

and that the following language be inserted in lieu thereof:

For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including expenses of the offices of the Governors of Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, as authorized by law (48 U. S. C., secs. 61, 531, 1422, 1431a (c), expenses of the Government of the Virgin Islands including the agricultural station, as authorized by law (48 U. S. C. 1405, 7 U. S. C. 386g), and expenses of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands appointed pursuant to the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress; compensation and mileage of members of the legislatures in Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and American Samoa as authorized by law (48 U. S. C., secs. 87, 599, 1421d (e), and 1431a (c)); compensation and expenses of the judiciary in American Samoa as authorized by law (48 U. S. C. 1431a (c)) and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress; care of insane as authorized by law for Alaska (48 U. S. C. 46-50); grants to the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, in addition to current local revenues, for support of governmental functions; and not to exceed \$50,000 for personal services, household equipment and furnishings, and utilities necessary in the operation of the several Governors' houses; \$7,020,000, of which not to exceed \$811,865 shall be available for personal services: Provided, That the Territorial and local governments of the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands are authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration: Provided further, That appropriations available for the Administration of Territories, including the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, may be expended for the purchase, maintenance, and operation of not to exceed four aircraft, 1 AK and 6 AKL type surface vessels, and such minor vessels as may be required, for official purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found by the Secretary to be necessary in carrying out the provisions of Article 6 (2) of the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress.

The language proposed by the committee as a substitute for the House language is substantially the same as that suggested in the budget estimates except that (1) a limit of \$50,000 has been placed upon the use of appropriated funds for personal services, household equipment and furnishings, and utilities necessary in the operation of the several Governors' houses, (2) language authorizing the use of funds for such purposes in the case of the residence of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territories has been omitted, (3) the number of aircraft and surface vessels authorized to be used for official and commercial transportation purposes has been limited to four aircraft and seven surface vessels (1 AK and 6 AKL) in addition to necessary minor vessels, and (4) citations of statutory authority for the various activities have been included wherever practicable.

ALASKA PUBLIC WORKS

The budget estimate for this appropriation is \$10,000,000. The House allowed \$7,000,000, and the committee recommends an appropriation of \$8,500,000. This amount is \$1,500,000 more than the House allowance and is \$1,500,000 less than the 1952 budget estimate.

Of the \$8,500,000 approved by the committee, not to exceed \$463,000 is to be available for administrative expenses, and of this amount not to exceed \$333,000 is to be available for personal services.

CONSTRUCTION OF ROADS, ALASKA

The committee has approved the House allowance, \$20,000,000, which amount is \$1,700,000 less than the budget estimate of \$21,700,000. Not to exceed \$2,493,000 of the \$20,000,000 appropriation is to be available for personal services.

Of the \$20,000,000 recommended by the committee for the fiscal year 1952, \$8,000,000 is for the liquidation of prior contract authorizations.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF ROADS, ALASKA

For this appropriation, the 1952 budget estimate is \$3,300,000 of which the House approved \$2,600,000.

The committee recommends an increase of \$300,000 in the activity "Major roads" to provide a total appropriation of \$2,900,000. This amount is \$400,000 less than the 1952 estimate.

Of the \$2,900,000 recommended by the committee, not to exceed \$1,935,840 is to be available for personal services.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, ALASKA ROADS

The committee recommends that the following paragraph in the bill be amended as indicated:

Not to exceed 25 20 per centum of the amount herein appropriated for construction of roads in Alaska shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired labor basis.

CONSTRUCTION, ALASKA RAILROAD

The committee has approved the House allowance, \$2,000,000, for this appropriation, which amount is \$500,000 less than the 1952 budget estimate and \$29,500,000 less than was appropriated for this purpose in the 1951 Interior Department Appropriation Act.

VIRGIN ISLANDS PUBLIC WORKS

The House allowed \$1,000,000, the amount of the 1952 budget estimate. The committee has reduced by 10 percent personal services included in the estimate, which reduction amounts to \$7,030. The appropriation recommended by the committee is \$992,970, and the personal service limitation is not to exceed \$63,270.

The committee recommends that the following proviso be added to the bill:

: Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the waterfront development project on St. Thomas, and the amount included in the 1952 budget estimates for this project is hereby made available for school and hospital facilities in the Virgin Islands

This proviso is in accord with the action of the House Appropriations Committee as stated in its report.

ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

For this appropriation the 1952 budget estimate is \$2,365,000. The House allowed an appropriation of \$2,000,000.

Included in the total estimate of \$2,365,000 is \$2,100,887 for personal services none of which is for operation and maintenance work.

The committee has applied a 10 percent reduction to the estimate for personal services, which reduction amounts to \$210,089. Deducting this amount from the total budget estimate of \$2,365,000 leaves an appropriation of \$2,154,911, which amount is recommended by the committee. This amount is \$154,911 over the amount approved by the House, and, as indicated, \$210,089 less than the 1952 budget estimate.

Of the appropriation of \$2,154,911 recommended by the committee, not to exceed \$1,890,798 is to be available for personal services.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

RESCISSION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS, SECTION 108

The committee recommends that the following section in the bill be amended as indicated:

SEC. 108. The balances of all contract authorizations heretofore granted to the Interior Department or any of its bureaus or offices, which remain ~~unused~~ *unobligated* on June 30, ~~1951~~ 1952, are hereby rescinded, ~~except public works in the Virgin Islands.~~

The committee has approved a 1-year extension of contract authorizations heretofore granted which have not been utilized. However, the committee believes that all balances of such contract authorizations which remain unobligated on June 30, 1952, should be rescinded and has so provided in the foregoing section.

TRANSFER OF EXCESS PROPERTY, SECTION 109

The committee recommends that the following new section be added to the bill:

SEC. 109. *Transfers to the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 of property, other than real, excess to the needs of Federal agencies may be made at the request of the Secretary without reimbursement or transfer of funds when required by the Department for operations conducted in the Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.*

This section authorizes the transfer of property to the Interior Department, other than real, excess to the needs of other Federal agencies, necessary in connection with the administration of the Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

After transfer takes place on July 1, 1951, of the jurisdiction of American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands from the Navy Department to the Interior Department, the latter Department is desirous of being in position to obtain from the Navy Department any vessels that may be declared excess, which will be required for transportation in the trust territory area, as well as other types of property, other than real, which may be excess to the needs of other Federal agencies but of value in administering the Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Under a provision contained in the 1951 Interior Department Appropriation Act, the Department was authorized to obtain equipment,

material, and supplies excess to the needs of Federal agencies when required by the Department for operations conducted in the Territories and island possessions.

VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

REVOLVING FUND

The committee has approved the budget estimate, \$2,595,000, for this appropriation, which amount is \$795,000 over the amount approved by the House.

The House committee made a reduction of \$795,000 in this appropriation, stating in its report as follows:

The proposal to purchase, maintain, and operate the power facilities on St. Croix is not approved. It is understood that it might be possible for funds to be obtained from the Rural Electrification Administration to better advantage for carrying out this activity than could be realized under the plans submitted for the Corporation. If that is incorrect, and if the plan of the Corporation is more advantageous it should be presented by officials of the Corporation in a manner to so demonstrate.

The committee has been informed that the Rural Electrification Administration cannot make such a loan to the federally chartered Virgin Islands Corporation under the law.

The power generating and distribution facilities on the island are under the control of three different operating agencies. The town of Christiansted is located at the west end of the island while the town of Fredericksted is located at the extreme east end of the island. These two properties are operated by the St. Croix Power Authority, a municipal corporation on the island of St. Croix. The committee was advised that these properties are obsolete facilities purchased from the Merwin Electric Co., that they are old, run down, and wholly inadequate to provide modern electric service, and that they were built primarily for the purpose of supplying only lighting service in these two towns. The towns' systems have been converted to alternating current without rehabilitation. These facilities have inadequate capacity for cooking, refrigeration, or any of the modern uses of electricity. The only source of alternating current available to these two towns is the Rural Electrification Administration generating plant on the island. Both of these towns have a population exceeding 1,500 and, therefore, have not ever been eligible for a loan from the Rural Electrification Administration.

The committee is recommending the \$795,000 proposed in the budget estimates to enable the Corporation to liquidate the investment of the St. Croix Power Authority, and the Rural Electrification Administration, and to increase the capacity of the overloaded generating and distribution facilities on the island of St. Croix. The breakdown of the \$795,000 recommended by the committee is as follows:

To liquidate REA loan (balance of loan Mar. 19, 1951) ..	\$391, 779. 32
New power facilities	218, 221. 68
Purchase of power authority properties	130, 000. 00
Operating capital	40, 000. 00
Rehabilitation of lines (cities)	25, 000. 00
Total recommended by committee	<u>795, 000. 00</u>

GRANTS

The House allowed the budget estimate, \$130,000, for "Grants", Virgin Islands Corporation, and this amount has been approved by the committee. For the fiscal year 1951, \$474,000 was appropriated for this purpose.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The bill as passed by the House carries a limitation of \$130,000 on the amount of the Corporation's funds to be available for administrative expenses. This is the amount proposed in the 1952 budget estimates and has been approved by the committee. This compares to a limitation of \$121,480 for the fiscal year 1951.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—TITLE III

SECTION 301—INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY WORK

The committee recommends that the following section in the bill be deleted:

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this Act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

and that the following new section be inserted in lieu thereof, which section was recently included by the Senate in the independent offices appropriation bill, 1952:

SEC. 301. No part of the money appropriated by this Act or made available for expenditure by the Virgin Islands Corporation which is in excess of 75 per centum of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by the Department of the Interior or the Virgin Islands Corporation during such fiscal year in the performance of—

(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material, shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2).

SECTION 302—CHAUFFEURS

The committee recommends that the following new section be added to the bill:

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance), unless such appropriation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the compensation of employees performing such duties.

SECTION 303—PERSONNEL EMPLOYEES

The committee recommends that the following new section be added to the bill, which section is similar to provisions included in the Labor-Federal Security and independent offices appropriation bills, 1952, recently passed by the Senate:

SEC. 303. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and fifteen, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half-time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.*

SECTION 304

The committee recommends that the following section be added to the bill, which was included in the 1951 Interior Department Appropriation Act, and which is carried in all other appropriation acts:

SEC. 304. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this Act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: Provided further, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence, and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: Provided further, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: Provided further, That in cases of emergency, caused by fire, flood, storm, act of God, or sabotage, persons may be employed for periods of not more than thirty days and be paid salaries and wages without the necessity of inquiring into their membership in any organization.*

INCREASES

The changes recommended by the committee in the amounts of the House bill are as follows:

Southeastern Power Administration:

Construction-----	\$342, 020
-------------------	------------

Southwestern Power Administration:

Construction of miscellaneous connecting facilities-----	500, 000
--	----------

Bonneville Power Administration:

Construction-----	5, 500, 000
Operation and maintenance-----	118, 439

Total increase, Bonneville Power Administration-----	5, 618, 439
--	-------------

INCREASES—Continued

Bureau of Land Management:

Management of lands and resources.....	\$822, 605
Construction.....	995, 000

Total increase, Bureau of Land Management..... 1, 817, 605

Bureau of Indian Affairs..... 2, 907, 866

As stated in the narrative part of this report, the House allowed the budget estimate under each appropriation paragraph for the Indian Bureau but placed an over-all limitation of \$65,000,000 on the amount to be appropriated. The committee has deleted this over-all limitation and fixed the amount it recommends for each appropriation under the Indian Bureau. The amount recommended for each appropriation appears under the narrative part of this report. The total recommendations of the committee for the Bureau represent a net increase of \$2,907,866 over the \$65,000,000 limitation fixed by the House and a reduction of \$3,517,134 under the 1952 budget estimates. The total of \$67,907,866 approved by the committee is \$7,567,189 less than was appropriated in the fiscal year 1951 after reductions were made under section 1214 of the General Appropriation Act.

Bureau of Reclamation:

General investigations.....	600, 000
Construction and rehabilitation.....	11, 344, 450

The net increase recommended by the committee is \$11,344,450. The amount recommended by the committee for each individual project is shown in the tables appearing earlier in this report. Where specific items have been approved or eliminated by the committee, such items have been itemized in the narrative part of this report under "Construction and rehabilitation."

Operation and maintenance.....	1, 074, 594
--------------------------------	-------------

Total increase, Bureau of Reclamation..... 13, 019, 044

Bureau of Mines:

Construction.....	350, 000
-------------------	----------

National Park Service:

Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities.....	69, 790
--	---------

Office of Territories:

Alaska Public Works.....	1, 500, 000
Operation and maintenance of roads, Alaska.....	300, 000
(Approved for the activity "Major roads".)	

Total increase, Office of Territories..... 1, 800, 000

Administration, Department of the Interior:

Salaries and expenses.....	154, 911
----------------------------	----------

Subtotal, increases, Department of the Interior.. 26, 579, 675

Virgin Islands Corporation:

Revolving fund.....	795, 000
---------------------	----------

Grand total, increases, Department of the Interior..... 27, 374, 675

DECREASES

Enforcement of Connally Hot Oil Act.....	\$15, 330
Southeastern Power Administration:	
Operation and maintenance.....	150, 000
Southwestern Power Administration:	
Construction.....	1, 560, 600
Operation and maintenance.....	19, 288
Total decreases, Southwestern Power Adminis- tration.....	1, 579, 888
Commission of Fine Arts:	
Salaries and expenses.....	5, 470
Bureau of Reclamation:	
General administrative expenses.....	21, 797
Emergency fund.....	100, 000
Geological Survey:	
Surveys, investigations, and research.....	600, 000
Bureau of Mines:	
Conservation and development of mineral resources.....	362, 797
Construction.....	12, 588
General administrative expenses.....	113, 159
Total decreases, Bureau of Mines.....	488, 544
National Park Service:	
Construction.....	605, 000
General administrative expenses.....	112, 726
Total decreases, National Park Service.....	717, 726
Fish and Wildlife Service:	
Management of resources.....	263, 442
Investigations of resources.....	16, 014
Construction.....	16, 258
General administrative expenses.....	75, 369
Total decreases, Fish and Wildlife Service.....	371, 083
Office of Territories:	
Virgin Islands Public Works.....	7, 030
Total decreases, Department of the Interior.....	4, 056, 868
Total increases.....	27, 374, 675
Total decreases.....	4, 056, 868
Net increase.....	23, 317, 807
Amount of bill as recommended to the Senate.....	520, 082, 307

PERMANENT AND INDEFINITE APPROPRIATIONS, GENERAL AND SPECIAL FUNDS

	Appropriated, 1951	Estimated, 1952	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
Continuing fund, Southeastern Power Administration.....	-----	\$50,000	+550,000
Continuing fund, Southwestern Power Administration.....	\$63,000	198,000	+135,000
Replacement of personal property sold.....	272,000	244,000	-28,000
Continuing fund for emergency expenses, Bonneville power project.....	147,000	-----	-147,000
Rango improvements.....	350,000	360,000	+10,000
Payments to States (proceeds of sales).....	20,000	75,000	+55,000
Payment of royalties to Oklahoma.....	4,125	4,000	-125
Leasing of grazing lands.....	6,000	6,000	-----
Payments to States (grazing fees).....	188	200	+12
Oregon and California grant lands, deficiency payments to counties in lieu of taxes.....	543,737	900,000	+356,263
Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, excess payments.....	10,000	10,000	-----
Oregon and California grant lands, excess payments.....	10,000	10,000	-----
Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, payments to Coos and Douglas Counties, Oregon, in lieu of taxes.....	285,182	350,000	+64,818
Oregon and California grant lands, payments to counties.....	1,812,457	3,750,000	+1,937,543
Payments to States from grazing receipts, public lands.....	358,688	381,400	+22,812
Mineral Leasing Act, payments to States.....	12,000,000	14,700,000	+2,700,000
Alaska school lands, payment to Alaska.....	750	750	-----
Claim and treaty obligations, Indian affairs.....	151,020	151,020	-----
Power revenues, Indian irrigation projects.....	1,500,000	1,500,000	-----
Acquisition of lands and loans to Indians in Oklahoma, act of June 26, 1936.....	10,305	500	-9,805
Indian arts and crafts fund.....	200	200	-----
Payments to States of Arizona and Nevada.....	600,000	600,000	-----
Repayment of advances from Treasury.....	4,500,000	4,500,000	-----

Continuing fund, emergency expenses, Fort Peck project, Montana.....	402,086	400,000	-2,086
Payments from proceeds of sale of water, Geological Survey.....	800	800	-----
Development and operation of helium properties, Bureau of Mines.....	435,000	435,000	-----
Educational expenses, children of employees, Yellowstone National Park.....	20,428	18,603	-1,825
Migratory bird conservation fund.....	3,800,000	3,800,000	-----
Federal aid in wildlife restoration.....	9,351,614	8,000,000	-1,351,614
Federal aid in fish restoration and management.....	-----	3,000,000	+3,000,000
Management of national wildlife refuges.....	324,899	300,000	-24,899
Administration of Pribilof Islands.....	-----	1,614,000	+1,614,000
Expenses, incident to sale of refuge products.....	32,000	32,000	-----
Payments to counties under Migratory Bird Conservation Act.....	108,300	100,000	-8,300
Alaska Railroad fund.....	14,500,000	15,000,000	+500,000
Total, general and special funds.....	51,619,769	60,491,473	+8,871,704

TRUST FUND APPROPRIATIONS

(Not a charge against revenue)

	Appropriated, 1951	Estimated, 1952	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
Construction of electric transmission lines and substations, contributions, Bonneville power project.....	\$26,628	-----	-\$26,628
Deposits by individuals for surveying public lands.....	16,750	\$16,750	-----
Administration and protection of grazing districts.....	50,000	50,000	-----
Miscellaneous trust funds, Bureau of Land Management.....	2,005,000	2,005,000	-----
Alaska town-site funds.....	1,000	1,000	-----
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor.....	1,250,000	1,250,000	-----
Miscellaneous trust funds of Indian tribes.....	55,000,000	12,000,000	-43,000,000
Operation and maintenance collections, Indian irrigation projects.....	1,500,000	1,500,000	-----
Advances by States, etc., for construction, operation, and maintenance of reclamation projects, including investigations.....	220,000	1,015,000	+795,000
Synthetic liquid fuels program, cooperative fund.....	13,000	-----	-13,000
Metallurgical research and pilot plants contributions, Bureau of Mines.....	7,500	-----	-7,500
Donations, including land, national parks.....	20,000	20,000	-----
Gifts or bequests of personal property, national parks.....	11,000	8,700	-2,300
Birthplace of Abraham Lincoln, preservation of, national parks.....	1,585	1,585	-----
Expenses, fur seal and fox industries, Pribilof Islands.....	30,000	-----	-30,000
Fox and fur seal industries.....	140,632	-----	-140,632
Miscellaneous contributed funds, Fish and Wildlife Service.....	100,000	100,000	-----
Improvement of roads, bridges, and trails, Alaska.....	230,000	220,000	-10,000
Total, appropriations, trust funds.....	60,623,065	18,188,035	-42,435,060
Total, permanent and indefinite appropriations, including trust funds.....	112,242,864	78,679,508	-33,563,356

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1951, AMOUNTS AS REDUCED UNDER SEC. 1214 (GENERAL REDUCTION OF \$550,000,000 IN GENERAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1951), ESTIMATES FOR 1952 AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1952

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Budget estimates, 1952	Recom- mended in House bill for 1952	Amount rec- ommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-) Senate bill compared with—		
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214				Appropriations, 1951 as reduced under sec. 1214	Estimates, 1952	House bill
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY								
Connally Hot Oil Act, enforcement of.....	\$180,000	\$180,000	\$174,000	\$174,000	\$158,670	-\$21,330	-\$15,330	-\$15,330
Power and energy studies, New England and New York.....			35,000				-35,000	
Working capital fund.....	300,000	300,000				-300,000		
Southeastern Power Administration:								
Construction.....	1 1,850,000	1 1,850,000	4,000,000		342,020	-1,507,980	-3,657,980	+342,020
Operation and maintenance.....	150,000	150,000	300,000	275,000	125,000	-25,000	-175,000	-150,000
Continuing fund.....			(²)	(²)				
Southwestern Power Administration:								
Construction.....	3 8,620,000	3 8,620,000	4 4,100,000	3,375,000	2,314,400	-6,305,600	-1,785,600	-1,060,600
Operation and maintenance.....	760,000	760,000	1 1,300,000	1,275,000	1,255,712	+495,712	-44,288	-19,288
Standardization of geographic names.....	2 2,500	2 2,500				-2,500		
Total, Office of the Secretary.....	11,862,500	11,862,500	9,909,000	5,099,000	4,195,802	-7,666,698	-5,713,198	-903,198
Commission of Fine Arts.....	14,530	14,530	7 27,000	20,000	14,530		-12,470	-5,470

¹ Appropriated in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.

² Continuing fund financed from power and energy receipts.

³ And \$1,750,000 contract authority.

⁴ Excludes \$427,300 for activities transferred in the estimates to "Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration."

⁵ Includes \$427,300 for activities previously carried under "Construction, Southwestern Power Administration."

⁶ Represents a temporary appropriation under Public Law 585, of June 29, 1950.

⁷ Includes \$9,000 in H. Doc. 66.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, amounts as reduced under sec. 1214 (general reduction of \$550,000,000 in General Appropriation Act, 1951), estimates for 1952, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Budget esti- mates, 1952	Recom- mended in House bill for 1952	Amount rec- ommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—) Senate bill compared with—		
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214				Appropri- ations, 1951 as reduced under sec. 1214	Estimates, 1952	House bill
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION								
Construction.....	\$ 40,950,000	\$ 40,950,000	\$73,650,000	\$62,000,000	\$67,500,605	+\$26,550,000	—\$6,150,000	+\$5,500,000
Operation and maintenance.....	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,500,000	5,250,000	5,368,439	+368,439	—131,561	+118,439
Total, Bonneville Power Administration.....	45,950,000	45,950,000	79,150,000	67,250,000	72,868,439	+26,918,439	—6,281,561	+5,618,439
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT								
Management of lands and resources.....	7,127,810	6,927,810	7,850,000	6,900,000	7,772,201	+794,795	—127,395	+822,605
Construction.....	700,000	650,000	1,000,000	-----	995,000	+345,000	—5,000	+995,000
Range improvements.....	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	-----	-----	-----
Payments to States (proceeds of sales).....	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	-----	-----	-----
Payment of royalties to Oklahoma.....	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	-----	-----	-----
Leasing of grazing lands.....	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	-----	-----	-----
Payments to States (grazing fees).....	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	(⁹)	-----	-----	-----
Total, Bureau of Land Management.....	7,827,810	7,577,810	8,850,000	6,900,000	8,717,605	+1,139,795	—132,395	+1,817,605

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS									
Health, education and welfare services.....	10 40,332,328	10 39,732,328	43,600,000	41,180,000	+1,447,672	-2,420,000			
Resources management.....	10,814,576	10,614,576	11,400,000	10,921,360	+306,784	-478,640			
Construction.....	11 23,477,651	11 19,137,651	12,000,000	11,683,104	-7,454,547	-316,896			
General administrative expenses.....	3,600,000	3,350,000	3,600,000	3,300,747	-279,253	-299,253			
Revolving fund for loans.....	2,400,000	2,400,000	800,000	800,000	-1,600,000				+2,907,866
Payment to Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations.....	10,500	10,500	25,000	22,655	+12,155				
Claims and treaty obligations.....	(12)	(12)	(12)	(12)					
Operation and maintenance, power systems, Indian irrigation projects.....	(12)	(12)	(12)	(12)					
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs, exclusive of tribal funds.....	80,635,055	75,475,055	71,425,000	67,907,866	-7,567,189	-3,517,134			+2,907,866
<i>Tribal funds (not included in totals of this tabulation)</i>	13 2, 437, 965	13 2, 437, 965	13 2, 075, 000	13 2, 109, 000	-328, 965	+34, 000			
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION									
General investigations.....	5,875,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	4,600,000	-900,000	-900,000			+600,000
Construction and rehabilitation.....	14 296,928,000	13 243,733,000	224,090,000	208,344,450	-35,388,550	-15,745,550			+11,344,450
Operation and maintenance.....	15,491,000	15,447,000	16,385,000	16,168,594	+721,594	-216,406			+1,074,594
General administrative expenses.....	7,200,000	6,864,000	6,000,000	5,500,000	-1,385,797	-521,797			-21,797
Emergency fund.....			500,000	400,000	+400,000	-100,000			-100,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation.....	325,494,000	271,544,000	252,475,000	234,991,247	-36,552,753	-17,483,753			+12,897,247
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY									
Surveys, investigations, and research.....	19,382,000	18,882,000	22,900,000	21,300,000	+2,418,000	-1,600,000			-600,000

8 And \$20,000,000 contract authority. Includes \$1,450,000 appropriated in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.

9 Indefinite appropriation of receipts.

10 Includes \$80,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.

11 Includes \$205,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951. Also \$3,500,000 contract authority.

12 Indefinite appropriation.

13 In addition to funds otherwise made available.

14 Includes \$1,100,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.

15 Includes \$1,100,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, amounts as reduced under sec. 1214 (general reduction of \$550,000,000 in General Appropriation Act, 1951), estimates for 1952, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Budget esti- mates, 1952	Recom- mended in House bill for 1952	Amount rec- ommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (–) Senate bill compared with—		
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214				Appropriations, 1951 as reduced under sec. 1214	Estimates, 1952	House bill
BUREAU OF MINES								
Conservation and development of mineral resources.....	¹⁶ \$18,008,000	¹⁶ \$17,658,000	¹⁷ \$18,700,000	\$17,950,000	\$17,587,203	–\$70,797	–\$1,112,797	–\$362,797
Health and safety.....	3,805,000	3,805,000	3,790,000	3,790,000	3,790,000	–15,000	-----	-----
Construction.....	¹⁸ 1,868,100	¹⁸ 1,868,100	1,600,000	1,250,000	1,587,412	–280,688	–12,588	+337,412
General administrative expenses.....	1,300,000	1,290,000	1,290,000	1,290,000	1,176,841	–113,159	–113,159	–113,159
Total, Bureau of Mines.....	24,981,100	24,621,100	25,380,000	24,280,000	24,141,456	–479,644	–1,238,544	–138,544
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE								
Management and protection.....	¹⁹ 7,728,700	¹⁹ 7,578,700	²⁰ 8,176,000	7,735,000	7,735,000	+156,300	–441,000	-----
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities.....	7,400,000	7,200,000	21 7,396,500	7,300,000	7,369,790	+169,790	–26,710	+69,790
Construction.....	²² 19,667,500	²² 16,467,500	11,975,000	11,975,000	11,370,000	–5,097,500	–605,000	–605,000
General administrative expenses.....	1,314,500	1,294,500	1,284,500	1,284,500	1,171,774	–122,726	–112,726	–112,726
Total, National Park Service.....	36,110,700	32,540,700	28,832,000	28,294,500	27,646,564	–4,894,136	–1,185,436	–647,936
FISH AND WILDLIFE								
Management of resources.....	7,082,000	6,932,000	6,870,000	6,870,000	6,606,588	–325,442	–263,442	–263,442
Investigations of resources.....	4,125,000	3,875,000	4,046,000	3,875,000	3,858,986	–16,014	–187,014	–16,014
Construction.....	²³ 2,533,450	²³ 1,858,450	750,000	750,000	733,742	–1,124,708	–16,258	–16,258
General administrative expenses.....	917,500	912,500	882,000	882,000	806,631	–105,869	–75,369	–75,369
Federal aid, in fish restoration and management.....	-----	-----	(²⁴)	(²⁴)	(²⁴)	-----	-----	-----
Administration of Pribilof Islands.....	-----	-----	(²⁵)	(²⁵)	(²⁵)	-----	-----	-----
Total, Fish and Wildlife Service.....	14,657,950	13,577,950	12,548,000	12,377,000	12,005,917	–1,572,033	–542,083	–371,083

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES									
Administration of Territories.....	25 3, 428, 180	25 3, 378, 180	9, 100, 000	7, 020, 000	7, 020, 000	7, 020, 000	+3, 641, 820	-2, 080, 000	-----
Alaska public works.....	9, 000, 000	8, 000, 000	10, 000, 000	7, 000, 000	7, 000, 000	8, 500, 000	+500, 000	-1, 500, 000	+1, 500, 000
Construction of roads, Alaska.....	26 27, 900, 000	26 27, 400, 000	21, 700, 000	20, 000, 000	20, 000, 000	20, 000, 000	-7, 400, 000	-1, 700, 000	-----
Operation and maintenance of roads, Alaska.....	2 600, 000	2 600, 000	3, 300, 000	2, 600, 000	2, 600, 000	2, 900, 000	+300, 000	-400, 000	+300, 000
Construction, Alaska Railroad.....	27 31, 500, 000	27 31, 500, 000	2, 500, 000	2, 000, 000	2, 000, 000	2, 000, 000	-29, 500, 000	-500, 000	-----
Virgin Islands public works.....	28 1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	992, 970	-7, 030	-7, 030	-7, 030
Total, Office of Territories.....	75, 428, 180	73, 878, 180	47, 600, 000	39, 620, 000	41, 412, 970	41, 412, 970	-32, 465, 210	-6, 187, 030	+1, 702, 970
Administration, Department of the Interior.....	2, 315, 000	2, 200, 000	2, 365, 000	2, 000, 000	2, 154, 911	2, 154, 911	-135, 089	-210, 089	+154, 911
Subtotal, Department of the Interior.....	644, 658, 825	578, 213, 825	561, 461, 000	494, 834, 500	517, 357, 307	517, 357, 307	-60, 856, 518	-44, 103, 693	+22, 522, 807
VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION									
Revolving fund.....	-----	-----	29 2, 595, 000	1, 800, 000	2, 595, 000	2, 595, 000	+2, 595, 000	-----	+795, 000
Grants.....	474, 000	474, 000	130, 000	130, 000	130, 000	130, 000	-344, 000	-----	-----
Administrative expenses 30.....	121, 480	121, 480	130, 000	130, 000	130, 000	130, 000	+8, 520	-----	-----
Total, Virgin Islands Corporation.....	474, 000	474, 000	2, 725, 000	1, 930, 000	2, 725, 000	2, 725, 000	+2, 251, 000	-----	+795, 000
Grand total, Department of the Interior.....	645, 132, 825	578, 687, 825	564, 186, 000	496, 764, 500	520, 082, 307	520, 082, 307	-58, 605, 518	-44, 103, 693	+23, 317, 837

- 16 Includes \$250,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.
 17 Includes \$750,000 in H. Doc. 66.
 18 Includes \$600,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.
 19 Includes \$40,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.
 20 Includes \$70,354 for activities previously carried under "Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities, National Park Service."
 21 Excludes \$70,354 transferred in the estimates to "Management and protection, National Park Service."
 22 Excludes \$600 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.
 23 Includes \$110,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.
 24 Indefinite appropriation of receipts.
 25 Includes \$36,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.
 26 Includes \$7,500,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.
 27 Includes \$1,500,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.
 28 And \$1,467,000 contract authority.
 29 Decreased from \$3,285,000 in H. Doc. 66.
 30 Corporate funds—not included in totals of this tabulation.

Also \$8,000,000 contract authority.





Calendar No. 471

82^D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3790

[Report No. 499]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 3 (legislative day, MAY 2), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JULY 3, 1951

Reported, under authority of the order of the Senate of July 2 (legislative day, June 27), 1951, by Mr. HAYDEN, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

4 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
5 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-
6 ment of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30,
7 1952, namely:

8 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

9 ENFORCEMENT OF CONNALLY HOT OIL ACT

10 For expenses necessary for controlling the interstate
11 shipment of contraband oil as required by law (15 U. S. C.

1 715), including purchase of not to exceed three passenger
 2 motor vehicles for replacement only, ~~\$174,000~~ \$158,670,
 3 of which not to exceed \$137,970 shall be available for
 4 personal services.

5 CONSTRUCTION, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

6 For construction and acquisition of transmission lines,
 7 substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administra-
 8 tive expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the pro-
 9 visions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16
 10 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area,
 11 to remain available until expended, \$342,020.

12 The sum of \$1,758,400, the unobligated portion of the
 13 \$1,850,000 appropriation contained in Chapter V of the
 14 Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law
 15 911, 81st Congress), under the heading "Department of the
 16 Interior, Southeastern Power Administration, Construction",
 17 is hereby rescinded and shall be carried to the surplus fund
 18 and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval
 19 of this Act.

20 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER

21 ADMINISTRATION

22 For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance
 23 of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric
 24 power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5

1 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as
2 applied to the southeastern power area, ~~\$275,000~~ \$125,000.

3 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

4 Appropriations of the Southeastern Power Administra-
5 tion shall be available for purchase of not to exceed ~~five~~ three
6 passenger motor vehicles. Appropriations made herein to
7 the Southeastern Power Administration shall be available
8 in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for
9 operation and maintenance shall be available only for the
10 service of the current fiscal year.

11 CONTINUING FUND, SOUTHEASTERN POWER

12 ADMINISTRATION

13 All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric
14 power and energy under the provisions of section 5 of the
15 Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (16 U. S. C.
16 825s), generated or purchased in the southeastern power
17 area, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States
18 as miscellaneous receipts, except that the Treasury shall
19 set up and maintain from such receipts a continuing fund of
20 \$50,000, and said fund shall be placed to the credit of the
21 Secretary, and shall be subject to check by him to defray
22 emergency expenses necessary to insure continuity of electric
23 service and continuous operation of Government facilities in
24 said area: *Provided, That the following paragraph under*

1 the heading "Office of the Secretary, Continuing Fund,
 2 Power Transmission Facilities", in the Interior Department
 3 Appropriation Act, 1950 (Public Law 350, 81st Congress),
 4 is hereby amended to read as follows:

5 CONTINUING FUND

6 Continuing Fund, Power Transmission Facilities: All
 7 receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and
 8 energy under the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control
 9 Act of December 22, 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), generated
 10 or purchased in the southwestern power area, shall be covered
 11 into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous
 12 receipts, except that the Treasury shall set up and maintain
 13 from such receipts a continuing fund of \$300,000, includ-
 14 ing the sum of \$100,000 in the continuing fund estab-
 15 lished under the Administrator of the Southwestern Power
 16 Administration in the First Supplemental National De-
 17 fense Appropriation Act, 1944 (57 Stat. 621), which
 18 shall be transferred to the fund hereby established: and
 19 said fund of \$300,000 shall be placed to the credit
 20 of the Secretary and shall be subject to check by him
 21 to defray emergency expenses necessary to insure continuity
 22 of electric service and continuous operation of the facilities.

23 CONSTRUCTION, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

24 For construction and acquisition of transmission lines,
 25 substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administra-

1 tive expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the pro-
 2 visions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16
 3 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area,
 4 to remain available until expended, ~~\$3,375,000~~ \$2,314,400,
 5 of which not to exceed \$586,800 shall be available for per-
 6 sonal services, and of which not to exceed \$600,000 is for
 7 liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority
 8 previously granted: ~~Provided, That this appropriation shall~~
 9 ~~not be expended for the construction of facilities designated~~
 10 ~~as comprising the western Missouri project.~~

11 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER

12 ADMINISTRATION

13 For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance
 14 of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric
 15 power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5
 16 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as
 17 applied to the southwestern power area, ~~\$1,275,000~~
 18 \$1,255,712, of which not to exceed \$900,712 shall be avail-
 19 able for personal services.

20 TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FACILITIES, DENISON DAM PROJECT

21 The jurisdiction and control of the Denison-Payne 132-
 22 kilovolt transmission line is hereby vested in the Secretary
 23 of the Interior, and the interdepartmental accounts shall be
 24 adjusted accordingly.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

1

2 Appropriations of the Southwestern Power Administra-
 3 tion shall be available for purchase of not to exceed ~~fifteen~~
 4 *eight* passenger motor vehicles, ~~of which eight shall be for re-~~
 5 placement only. Appropriations made herein to the South-
 6 western Power Administration shall be available in one fund,
 7 except that the appropriation herein made for operation and
 8 maintenance shall be available only for the service of the
 9 current fiscal year.

10

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

11

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For expenses made necessary by the Act establishing
 13 a Commission of Fine Arts (40 U. S. C. 104), including
 14 payment of actual traveling expenses of the members and
 15 secretary of the Commission in attending meetings and
 16 committee meetings of the Commission either within or out-
 17 side the District of Columbia, to be disbursed on vouchers
 18 approved by the Commission, ~~\$20,000~~ \$14,530.

19

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

20

CONSTRUCTION

21 For construction and acquisition of transmission lines,
 22 substations, and appurtenant facilities, as authorized by law,
 23 to remain available until expended, ~~\$62,000,000~~ \$67,500,-
 24 000, *of which not to exceed \$8,387,470 shall be available for*
 25 *personal services, and* of which not to exceed \$21,000,000

1 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority
2 previously granted.

3 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

4 For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance
5 of the Bonneville transmission system and of marketing
6 electric power and energy, ~~\$5,250,000~~ \$5,368,439, of which
7 not to exceed \$3,983,862 shall be available for personal
8 services.

9 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

10 Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administration
11 shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed upon
12 the Administrator pursuant to law, including not to exceed
13 \$40,000 for services as authorized by Section 15 of the Act
14 of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including such services
15 at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem for individuals; pur-
16 chase of not to exceed twelve passenger motor vehicles of
17 ~~which twelve~~ shall be for replacement only; and purchase
18 (not to exceed two) of aircraft. Appropriations made herein
19 to the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available
20 in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for
21 operation and maintenance shall be available only for the
22 service of the current fiscal year.

23 Not to exceed 12 per centum of the appropriation for
24 construction herein made for the Bonneville Power Admin-
25 istration shall be available for construction work by force

1 account or on a hired-labor basis, except in case of emer-
 2 gancies, local in character, so declared by the Bonneville
 3 Power Administrator.

4 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

5 MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

6 For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement,
 7 development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and
 8 performance of other functions, as authorized by law, in
 9 the management of lands and their resources under the
 10 jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, \$6,900,000,
 11 of which \$1,200,000 shall be used for soil and moisture con-
 12 servation \$7,722,605, of which not to exceed \$4,864,096 shall
 13 be available for personal services: *Provided*, That this ap-
 14 propriation may be expended on a reimbursable basis for
 15 surveys of lands other than those under the jurisdiction of
 16 the Bureau of Land Management.

17 CONSTRUCTION

18 *For construction of access roads on the revested Oregon*
 19 *and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon*
 20 *Road grant lands; acquisition of rights-of-way and of exist-*
 21 *ing connecting roads adjacent to such lands; to remain avail-*
 22 *able until expended, \$995,000, of which not to exceed*
 23 *\$45,000 shall be available for personal services: Provided,*
 24 *That the amount appropriated herein for road construction*

1 *shall be transferred to the Bureau of Public Roads, Depart-*
 2 *ment of Commerce.*

3 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

4 Appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management shall
 5 be available for purchase of not to exceed ~~thirty-two~~ *twenty-*
 6 *five* passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and
 7 alteration and maintenance of necessary buildings and appur-
 8 tenant facilities to which the United States has title: *Pro-*
 9 *vided*, That of appropriations herein made for the Bureau of
 10 Land Management expenditures in connection with the re-
 11 vested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos
 12 Bay Wagon Road grant lands shall be reimbursed from the
 13 25 per centum referred to in section C, title II, of the Act
 14 approved August 28, 1937, of the special fund designated the
 15 "Oregon and California Land Grand Fund" and section 4
 16 of the Act approved May 24, 1939, of the special fund des-
 17 ignated the "Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant Fund".

18 RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

19 For construction, purchase, and maintenance of range
 20 improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and
 21 10 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C.
 22 315), sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received,
 23 during the current fiscal year, as range improvement fees

1 under section 3 of said Act and of 25 per centum of all
2 moneys received, during the current fiscal year, under sec-
3 tion 15 of said Act, to remain available until expended.

4 PAYMENTS TO STATES (PROCEEDS OF SALES)

5 For payment to the several States of 5 per centum of
6 the net proceeds of sales of public lands and materials lying
7 within their limits, for the purpose of education or of
8 making public roads and improvements, sums equal to the
9 aggregate of all moneys received in accordance with sec-
10 tion 4 of the Act of June 26, 1934 (31 U. S. C. 725c);
11 during the current and succeeding fiscal years, and includ-
12 ing in the fiscal year 1952 the unappropriated balance of
13 receipts of prior fiscal years, to remain available until
14 expended.

15 PAYMENT TO OKLAHOMA (ROYALTIES)

16 For payment to the State of Oklahoma in lieu of all
17 State and local taxes upon tribal funds accruing under the
18 provisions of the joint resolution of June 12, 1926 (44
19 Stat. 740), to be expended by the State in the same manner
20 as if received under section 35 of the Act approved February
21 25, 1920 (30 U. S. C. 191), sums equal to $37\frac{1}{2}$ per centum
22 of the royalties received during the current and each suc-
23 ceeding fiscal year, from the south half of Red River in
24 Oklahoma under the provisions of said joint resolution of
25 June 12, 1926, to remain available until expended.

LEASING OF GRAZING LANDS

For leasing State, county, or privately owned lands in accordance with the provisions of the Act of June 23, 1938 (43 U. S. C. 315m-1), sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received during the current and each succeeding fiscal year, in accordance with the Act of June 23, 1938 (43 U. S. C. 315m-4), to remain available until expended.

PAYMENTS TO STATES (GRAZING FEES)

Sums not in excess of $33\frac{1}{3}$ per centum of all grazing fees received during the current and each succeeding fiscal year from each grazing district on Indian lands ceded to the United States for disposition under the public-land laws, to remain available until expended for payment to the State in which said lands are situated, in accordance with the provisions of section 11 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C. 315j).

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

~~SALARIES AND EXPENSES~~

~~For expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, \$65,000,000, to be available in not to exceed the amounts indicated respectively for the following purposes:~~

~~HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE SERVICES~~

~~Health, education, and welfare services: For expenses necessary to provide health, education, and welfare services for Indians, either directly or in cooperation with States and~~

1 other organizations, including payment (in advance or from
 2 date of admission) of care, tuition, assistance, and other
 3 expenses of Indians in boarding homes, institutions, or
 4 schools; grants and other assistance to needy Indians; main-
 5 tenance of law and order, and payment of rewards for
 6 information or evidence concerning violations of law on
 7 Indian reservations or lands; and operation of Indian arts
 8 and craft shops and museum; ~~\$43,600,000~~ \$41,180,000,
 9 of which not to exceed \$23,699,661 shall be available for
 10 personal services.

11 *RESOURCES MANAGEMENT*

12 ~~Resources management:~~ For expenses necessary for
 13 management, development, improvement, and protection of
 14 resources and appurtenant facilities under the jurisdiction of
 15 the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including payment of irrigation
 16 assessments and charges; acquisition of water rights; con-
 17 ducting agricultural experiments and demonstrations; fur-
 18 nishing plants or seed to Indians; advances for Indian indus-
 19 trial and business enterprises; payment of expenses of Indian
 20 fairs, including premiums for exhibits; and development of
 21 Indian arts and crafts as authorized by law (25 U. S. C.
 22 305), including expenses of exhibits; ~~\$11,400,000~~ \$10,-
 23 921,360, of which not to exceed \$6,843,485 shall be available
 24 for personal services.

CONSTRUCTION

~~Construction:~~ For construction, major repair, and improvement of irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, roads and trails, and other facilities; acquisition of lands and interests in lands; preparation of lands for farming; and architectural and engineering services by contract; to remain available until expended, ~~\$12,000,000,~~ \$11,683,104, of which not to exceed \$2,852,067 shall be available for personal services, and of which not to exceed \$3,125,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted: *Provided*, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside or outside the boundaries of existing reservations.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

~~General administrative expenses:~~ For expenses necessary for the general administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including such expenses in field offices, ~~\$3,600,000~~

1 \$3,300,747, of which not to exceed \$2,693,281 shall be
2 available for personal services.

3 REVOLVING FUND FOR LOANS

4 ~~Revolving fund for loans:~~ For an additional amount
5 for loans as authorized by sections 10 and 11 of the Act
6 of June 18, 1934 (25 U. S. C. 470, 471), as amended
7 and supplemented, and section 1 of the Act of April 19,
8 1950 (Public Law 474), \$800,000.

9 PAYMENT TO CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW NATIONS OF
10 INDIANS, OKLAHOMA

11 ~~Payment to Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians,~~
12 ~~Oklahoma:~~ For an additional amount for "Payment to
13 Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians, Oklahoma",
14 for defraying the expenses of making per capita payments
15 authorized by the Acts of June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 483),
16 and June 24, 1948 (Public Law 754, Eightieth Congress),
17 ~~\$25,000~~ \$22,655, of which not to exceed \$21,105 shall be
18 available for personal services.

19 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

20 Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except
21 the revolving fund for loans) shall be available for purchase
22 of not to exceed ~~one hundred and ninety-one~~ passenger
23 motor vehicles, of which ~~one hundred and ninety-one~~ shall
24 be for replacement ~~only~~ one hundred and twenty-five passen-
25 ger motor vehicles for replacement only, which may be used

1 for the transportation of Indians; purchase of ice for official
2 use of employees; services as authorized by section 15 of the
3 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including not to ex-
4 ceed \$5,000 for expenditure at rates for individuals not in
5 excess of \$50 per diem on irrigation and power matters,
6 when authorized by the Secretary; and expenses required
7 by continuing or permanent treaty provisions.

8 CLAIMS AND TREATY OBLIGATIONS

9 For fulfilling treaties with Senecas and Six Nations of
10 New York, Choctaws and Pawnees of Oklahoma, and pay-
11 ment to Indians of Sioux reservations, to be expended as
12 provided by law, such amounts as may be necessary after
13 June 30, 1951.

14 PROCEEDS FROM POWER

15 Sums not in excess of the amount of power revenues
16 covered into the Treasury during the current and each suc-
17 ceeding fiscal year to the credit of each of the power projects,
18 including revenues credited prior to August 7, 1946, to
19 remain available until expended for the purposes authorized
20 by section 3 of the Act of August 7, 1946, as amended
21 (31 U. S. C. 725s-3), in connection with the respective
22 projects from which such revenues are derived.

23 TRIBAL FUNDS

24 In addition to the tribal funds authorized to be expended
25 by existing law, there is hereby appropriated \$2,109,000

1 from tribal funds not otherwise available for expenditure for
2 the benefit of Indians and Indian tribes, including pay and
3 travel expenses of employees; care, tuition and other assist-
4 ance to Indian children attending public and private schools
5 (which may be paid in advance or from date of admission) ;
6 purchase of land and improvements on land, title to which
7 shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for
8 the tribe for which purchased; lease of lands and water rights;
9 compensation and expenses of attorneys and other per-
10 sons employed by Indian tribes under approved contracts;
11 pay, travel and other expenses of tribal officers, councils,
12 and committees thereof, or other tribal organizations, in-
13 cluding mileage for use of privately owned automobiles
14 and per diem in lieu of subsistence at rates established
15 administratively but not to exceed those applicable to
16 civilian employees of the Government; relief of Indians,
17 without regard to section 7 of the Act of May 27, 1930
18 (46 Stat. 391) , including cash grants; and employment of a
19 recreational director for the Menominee Reservation and a
20 curator for the Osage Museum, each of whom shall be
21 appointed with the approval of the respective tribal councils
22 and without regard to the classification laws: *Provided*, That
23 in addition to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds
24 may be advanced to Indian tribes during the current fiscal
25 year for such purposes as may be designated by the gov-

erning body of the particular tribe involved and approved by the Secretary: *Provided further, however*, That no part of this appropriation *or other tribal funds* shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming, either inside or outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

For carrying out the functions of the Bureau of Reclamation as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) and other Acts applicable to that Bureau, as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans; engineering and economic investigations, as a basis for legislation, and for reports thereon to Congress, relating to projects for the development and utilization of the water resources of Alaska; formulating plans and preparing designs and specifications for authorized Federal reclamation projects or parts thereof prior to appropriations for construction of such projects or parts; and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial ad-

1 justment, or extension of existing projects; to remain
 2 available until expended, \$4,000,000, \$4,600,000, of which
 3 not to exceed \$3,163,396 shall be available for personal serv-
 4 ices, and of which ~~\$3,500,000~~ \$3,903,500 shall be derived
 5 from the reclamation fund and \$500,000 shall be derived from
 6 the Colorado River development fund: *Provided*, That the
 7 expenditure of any sums from this appropriation for investiga-
 8 tions of any nature requested by States, municipalities, or
 9 other interests shall be upon the basis of the State, munici-
 10 pality, or other interest advancing at least 50 per centum of
 11 the estimated cost of such investigations: *Provided further*,
 12 That, except as herein expressly provided with respect to
 13 investigations in Alaska, no part of this appropriation shall be
 14 expended in the conduct of activities which are not author-
 15 ized by law.

16 CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

17 For construction and rehabilitation of authorized rec-
 18 lamation projects or parts thereof (including power trans-
 19 mission facilities) and for other related activities, as au-
 20 thorized by law, to remain available until expended,
 21 ~~\$197,000,000~~, \$208,344,450, of which not to exceed
 22 \$29,160,408 shall be available for personal services, and of
 23 which ~~\$29,202,200~~ \$28,972,650 shall be derived from the
 24 reclamation fund: ~~*Provided*~~, That no part of this appropria-
 25 tion shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission

1 facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service
2 contracts which include provision for service to Federal estab-
3 lishments and preferred customers: *Provided, That no part*
4 *of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction*
5 *of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power*
6 *wheeling service contracts which include provision for service*
7 *to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except*
8 *those transmission facilities for which construction funds have*
9 *been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are neces-*
10 *sary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facili-*
11 *ties which the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to*
12 *provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service*
13 *to a Federal establishment or preferred customer: Provided*
14 *further, That in order to promote agreement among the States*
15 *of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado, and to avoid any*
16 *possible alteration of existing vested water rights, no part of*
17 *this or of any prior appropriation shall be used for construc-*
18 *tion or for further commitment for construction of the*
19 *Glendo unit or any feature thereof, until a definite plan*
20 *report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of*
21 *Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado, and approved by Con-*
22 *gress: Provided further, That no part of this or prior ap-*
23 *propriations shall be used for construction, nor for further*
24 *commitments to construction of Moorhead Dam and Reser-*
25 *voir, Montana, or any feature thereof until a definite plan*

1 *report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States*
 2 *of Wyoming and Montana, and approved by the Congress.*

3 Of the amount appropriated under the preceding para-
 4 graph, \$1,000,000 is for partial liquidation of the contract
 5 authority granted under the appropriation "General fund,
 6 construction, Missouri River Basin", in the Interior Depart-
 7 ment Appropriation Act, 1950.

8 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

9 For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects
 10 or parts thereof and of other facilities, as authorized by law;
 11 and for a soil and moisture conservation program on lands
 12 under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant
 13 to law, ~~\$15,094,000~~ \$16,168,594, of which ~~not to exceed~~
 14 ~~\$12,592,900~~ \$12,476,494 shall be derived from the recla-
 15 mation fund and ~~not to exceed~~ \$1,671,000 \$1,862,000 shall
 16 be derived from the Colorado River dam fund, *and of which*
 17 *not to exceed \$10,331,434 shall be available for personal*
 18 *services: Provided, That funds advanced for operation*
 19 *and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof*
 20 *shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and*
 21 *may be expended for the same objects and in the same*
 22 *manner as sums appropriated herein may be expended,*
 23 *and the unexpended balances of such advances shall be*
 24 *credited to the appropriation for the next succeeding fiscal*
 25 *year.*

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of general administration and related functions in the offices of the Commissioner of Reclamation and in the regional offices of the Bureau of Reclamation, ~~\$5,500,000~~ \$5,478,203, of which not to exceed \$4,696,178 shall be available for personal services, to be derived from the reclamation fund and to be non-reimbursable pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377): *Provided*, That no part of any other appropriation in this Act shall be available for activities or functions budgeted for the current fiscal year as general administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That not exceeding \$150,000 of funds available for expenditure under this appropriation shall be used for salaries and expenses in connection with information work.

EMERGENCY FUND

For an additional amount for the emergency fund as authorized by the Act of June 26, 1948 (43 U. S. C. 502), ~~\$500,000~~ \$400,000, to be derived from the Reclamation fund, special fund, and to remain available until expended for the purposes specified in said Act.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FACILITIES, FORT PECK PROJECT,

MONTANA

The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to transfer to the Department of the Interior without exchange of

1 *funds, all of the right, title, and interest of the Department*
 2 *of the Army in and to the following facilities, including*
 3 *rights-of-way (except that portion of the rights-of-way within*
 4 *the Fort Peck Reservoir area), but there shall be reserved*
 5 *the right to use the power facilities for the purpose of trans-*
 6 *mitting power to the Fort Peck project during emergency*
 7 *periods when the Fort Peck power plant is not functioning:*
 8 *(a) the Fort Peck-Rainbow (Great Falls) 161 kilovolt*
 9 *transmission line; (b) the Rainbow (Great Falls) terminal*
 10 *facilities; and (c) the Fort Peck-Whatley 50 kilovolt trans-*
 11 *mission line and substation.*

12 SPECIAL FUNDS

13 Sums herein referred to as being derived from the recla-
 14 mation fund, the Colorado River dam fund, or the Colorado
 15 River development fund, are appropriated from the special
 16 funds in the Treasury created by the Act of June 17, 1902
 17 (43 U. S. C. 391), the Act of December 21, 1928 (43
 18 U. S. C. 617a), and the Act of July 19, 1940 (43 U. S. C.
 19 618a), respectively. Such sums shall be transferred, upon
 20 request of the Secretary, to be merged with and expended
 21 under the heads herein specified; and the unexpended bal-
 22 ances of sums transferred for expenditure under the heads
 23 "Operation and maintenance" and "General administrative
 24 expenses" shall revert and be credited to the special fund
 25 from which derived.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

1 Appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation shall be
2 available for purchase of not to exceed one hundred
3 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed
4 ~~\$30,000~~ \$50,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of
5 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including such
6 services at rates for individuals not to exceed ~~\$50~~ \$100 per
7 day, when authorized by the Secretary; payment of claims for
8 damage to or loss of property, personal injury, or death arising
9 out of activities of the Bureau of Reclamation; payment,
10 except as otherwise provided for, of compensation and expense
11 of persons on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation
12 appointed as authorized by law to represent the United States
13 in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts
14 without reimbursement or return under the reclamation laws;
15 rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of
16 law involving property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of
17 Reclamation; performance of the functions specified under the
18 head "Operation and Maintenance Administration", Bureau
19 of Reclamation, in the Interior Department Appropriation
20 Act, 1945; preparation and dissemination of useful information
21 including recordings, photographs, and photographic
22 prints; and studies of recreational uses of reservoir areas, as
23 authorized by law and investigation and recovery of archeological
24 and paleontological remains in such areas in the same
25

1 manner as provided for in the Act of August 21, 1935 (16
2 U. S. C. 461-467): *Provided*, That no part of any appropri-
3 ation made herein shall be available pursuant to the Act of
4 April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377), for expenses other than
5 those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects ex-
6 cept ~~\$5,500,000 under the head~~ "General Administrative
7 Expenses" and ~~\$1,000,000 amounts provided~~ for reconnais-
8 sance, basin surveys, and general engineering and research
9 under the head "General Investigations."

10 Allotments to the Missouri River Basin project from the
11 appropriation under the head "Construction and rehabilita-
12 tion" shall be available additionally for said project for those
13 functions of the Bureau of Reclamation provided for under
14 the head "General investigations" (but this authorization
15 shall not preclude use of the appropriation under said head
16 within that area), and for the continuation of investigations
17 by agencies of the Department on a general plan for the
18 development of the Missouri River Basin. Such allotments
19 may be expended through or in cooperation with State and
20 other Federal agencies, and advances to such agencies are
21 hereby authorized.

22 Sums appropriated herein which are expended in the
23 performance of functions of the Bureau of Reclamation shall

1 be reimbursable or returnable to the extent and in the manner
2 provided by law.

3 Any agency of the United States Government having
4 title thereto is authorized to transfer to the Bureau of
5 Reclamation, without reimbursement, parts, equipment and
6 supplies for aircraft excess to its needs.

7 No part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Rec-
8 lamation, contained in this Act or in any prior Act,
9 which represents amounts earned under the terms of a con-
10 tract but remaining unpaid, shall be obligated for any other
11 purpose, regardless of when such amounts are to be paid:
12 *Provided*, That the incurring of any obligation prohibited
13 by this paragraph shall be deemed a violation of section
14 665 of title 31 of the United States Code.

15 No funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation
16 for operation and maintenance, except those derived from
17 advances by water users, shall be used for the particular
18 benefit of lands (a) within the boundaries of an irrigation
19 district, (b) of any member of a water users' organization,
20 or (c) of any individual, when such district, organization,
21 or individual is in arrears for more than twelve months
22 in the payment of charges due under a contract entered

1 into with the United States pursuant to laws administered
2 by the Bureau of Reclamation.

3 Not to exceed ~~\$1,684,000~~ \$2,783,000 of the appropria-
4 tion herein made for "Construction and rehabilitation, Bureau
5 of Reclamation" shall be ~~available for expenditure toward~~
6 *expended for* completion of construction of the Coachella
7 division of the All-American Canal system, Boulder Canyon
8 project: *Provided*, That ~~prior thereto contractual arrange-~~
9 ~~ments satisfactory to the Secretary shall be made for repay-~~
10 ~~ment of~~ *any* sums *thereof* so expended in excess of the amount
11 required to be repaid under the existing contract between the
12 Coachella Valley County Water District and the United
13 States *shall be repayable by said district to the United States*
14 *unless said district shall be judicially determined to be not*
15 *liable therefor.*

16 Not to exceed 12 per centum of the construction allot-
17 ment made by the Bureau of Reclamation for any project
18 from the appropriation "Construction and Rehabilitation"
19 contained in this Act shall be available for construction
20 work by force account or on a hired-labor basis; except
21 that not to exceed \$225,000 may on approval of the Com-
22 missioner be expended for construction work by force

1 account on any one project or Missouri Basin unit when the
 2 work is unsuitable for contract or when excessive bids are
 3 received; and except in cases of emergencies local in char-
 4 acter, so declared by the Commissioner.

5 GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

6 SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

7 For expenses necessary for the Geological Survey to
 8 perform surveys, investigations, and research covering topog-
 9 raphy, geology, and the mineral and water resources of the
 10 United States, its Territories and possessions; classify lands
 11 as to mineral character and water and power resources; give
 12 engineering supervision to power permits and Federal Power
 13 Commission licenses; enforce departmental regulations appli-
 14 cable to oil, gas, and other mining leases, permits, licenses;
 15 and operating contracts; and publish and disseminate data
 16 relative to the foregoing activities; ~~\$21,900,000,~~ \$21,300,-
 17 000, *of which not to exceed \$13,455,000 shall be available*
 18 *for personal services, and* of which \$3,300,000 shall be
 19 available only for cooperation with States or municipalities
 20 for water resources investigations: *Provided, That the share*
 21 *of the Geological Survey in any topographic mapping or*
 22 *water resources investigations carried on in cooperation with*

1 any State or municipality shall not exceed 50 per centum
2 of the cost thereof.

3 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

4 The amount appropriated for the Geological Survey
5 shall be available for purchase of not to exceed eighty passen-
6 ger motor vehicles for replacement only; reimbursement of
7 the General Services Administration for security guard serv-
8 ice for protection of confidential files; contracting for the
9 furnishing of topographic maps and for the making of geo-
10 physical or other specialized surveys when it is administra-
11 tively determined that such procedures are in the public
12 interest; construction and maintenance of necessary buildings
13 and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands for gaging sta-
14 tions; and payment of compensation and expenses (not to
15 exceed \$10,000) of the person appointed by the President
16 to participate as the representative of the United States
17 in the administration of the compact consented to by the
18 Act of May 31, 1949 (Public Law 82): *Provided, That*
19 notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Presi-
20 dent is authorized to appoint a retired officer as such repre-
21 sentative, without prejudice to his status as a retired Army
22 officer, and he shall receive such compensation and expenses
23 in addition to his retired pay.

BUREAU OF MINES

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL

RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for promoting the conservation, exploration, development, production, and utilization of mineral resources, including fuels, in the United States, its Territories, and possessions; developing synthetics and substitutes; producing and distributing helium; and controlling fires in inactive coal deposits on public lands, and on private lands, with the consent of the owners; \$17,950,000 \$17,587,203, of which not to exceed \$10,639,175 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That the Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to make suitable arrangements with owners of private property or with a State or its subdivisions for payment of a sum equal to not less than one-half the amount of expenditure to be made for control or extinguishment of fires in inactive coal deposits from funds provided under the authorization of this Act except that expenditure of Federal funds for this purpose in any privately owned operating coal mine shall be limited to investigation and supervision.

HEALTH AND SAFETY

For expenses necessary for promotion of health and safety in mines and in the minerals industries, as authorized by law, \$3,790,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and improvement of facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Mines, to remain available until expended, ~~\$1,250,000~~ \$1,587,412, of which not to exceed \$113,287 shall be available for personal services.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Mines, including such expenses in the regional offices, ~~\$1,290,000~~ \$1,176,841, of which not to exceed \$1,018,434 shall be available for personal services.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of Mines may be expended for purchase of not to exceed one hundred and thirty passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; providing transportation services in isolated areas for employees, student dependents of employees, and other pupils, and such activities may be financed under cooperative arrangements; temporary and emergency contracts for personal services and employment of persons without regard to civil-service regulations as required in the conduct of programs for the control of fires in inactive coal deposits and flood prevention

1 in anthracite mines; purchase and bestowal of certificates
2 and trophies in connection with mine rescue and first-aid
3 work: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to accept
4 lands, buildings, equipment and other contributions from
5 public and private sources and to prosecute projects in coop-
6 eration with other agencies, Federal, State, or private: *Pro-*
7 *vided further*, That power produced in the operation of the
8 power plant of the Bureau of Mines at Louisiana, Missouri,
9 in excess of the Bureau's needs may be sold to non-Federal
10 purchasers, but the expenses of the Bureau in the production
11 and sale of such excess power shall not exceed the total
12 amount of such sales, and expenditures for the production
13 of excess power shall not be deemed a charge against the
14 total appropriations authorized by the Synthetic Liquid Fuels
15 Act, as amended: *Provided further*, That the sums made
16 available for the current fiscal year to the Departments of the
17 Army, Navy, and Air Force for the acquisition of helium
18 from the Bureau of Mines shall be transferred to the Bureau
19 of Mines on July 1 of said fiscal year: *Provided further*,
20 That the Bureau of Mines is authorized, during the current
21 fiscal year, to sell directly or through any Government
22 agency, including corporations, any metal or mineral product
23 that may be manufactured in pilot plants operated by the
24 Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such sales shall be
25 covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

1 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

2 MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

3 For expenses necessary for the management and pro-
4 tection of the areas and facilities administered by the
5 National Park Service, including protection of lands in
6 process of condemnation; and for plans, investigations, and
7 studies of the recreational resources (exclusive of prepara-
8 tion of detailed plans and working drawings) and archaeo-
9 logical values in river basins of the United States (except
10 the Missouri River Basin) ; \$7,735,000, *of which not to*
11 *exceed \$6,584,342 shall be available for personal services:*
12 *Provided, That the unexpended balance of the appropriation*
13 *granted under this head for the fiscal year 1951 for the*
14 *“Mississippi River Parkway” shall remain available during*
15 *the current fiscal year.*

16 MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL
17 FACILITIES

18 For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance,
19 and rehabilitation of roads, trails, buildings, utilities, and
20 other physical facilities essential to the operation of areas
21 administered pursuant to law by the National Park Service,
22 ~~\$7,300,000~~ \$7,369,790, *of which not to exceed \$4,193,747*
23 *shall be available for personal services.*

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and improvement, without regard to the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended (16 U. S. C. 451), of roads, trails, parkways, buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities; and the acquisition of lands, interests therein, improvements, and water rights; to remain available until expended, ~~\$11,975,000~~ \$11,370,000, of which not to exceed \$945,000 shall be available for personal services, and of which \$1,150,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under the head "Independence National Historical Park, Pennsylvania", in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950, and \$3,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in section 4 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the National Park Service, including such expenses in the regional offices, ~~\$1,284,500~~ \$1,171,774, of which not to exceed \$1,014,538 shall be available for personal services.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the National Park Service shall be available for purchase of not to exceed nineteen passenger

1 motor vehicles for replacement only; cleaning and repair
2 of uniforms for National Capital Parks police and guards;
3 and the objects and purposes specified in the Act of August
4 7, 1946 (16 U. S. C. 17j-2).

5 FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

6 MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES

7 For expenses necessary for conservation, management,
8 protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources, and
9 for the performance of other authorized functions related to
10 such resources; operation of the industrial properties within
11 the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770);
12 maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita
13 Mountains Wildlife Refuge; purchase or rent of land, and
14 functions related to wildlife management in California (16
15 U. S. C. 695-695c); and not to exceed \$30,000 for pay-
16 ment, in the discretion of the Secretary, for information or
17 evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the
18 Fish and Wildlife Service; ~~\$6,870,000~~ \$6,606,558, of which
19 *not to exceed \$4,259,363 shall be available for personal*
20 *services.*

21 INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

22 For expenses necessary for scientific and economic
23 studies and investigations respecting conservation, manage-
24 ment, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife re-
25 sources, including related aquatic plants and products; col-

lection, compilation, and publication of information concerning such studies and investigations; and the performance of other functions related thereto; as authorized by law; ~~\$3,875,000~~ \$3,858,986, of which not to exceed \$2,487,629 shall be available for personal services: Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for investigations, surveys, studies, trapping or similar work in foreign countries.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources and the acquisition of lands and interests therein, including continuing the construction of fish cultural facilities on lands owned by the State of South Dakota; to remain available until expended, ~~\$750,000~~ \$733,742, of which not to exceed \$146,324 shall be available for personal services.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Fish and Wildlife Service, including such expenses in the regional offices, ~~\$882,000~~ \$806,631, of which not to exceed \$678,319 shall be available for personal services.

FEDERAL AID IN FISH RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 9, 1950 (Public Law 681), amounts equal to the revenues

1 described in section 3 of said Act and credited during the next
2 preceding fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, to remain
3 available until expended.

4 ADMINISTRATION OF PRIBILOF ISLANDS

5 For carrying out the provisions of the Act of February
6 26, 1944, as amended (16 U. S. C. 631a-631q), amounts
7 equal to 60 per centum of the proceeds covered into the
8 Treasury during the next preceding fiscal year from the
9 sale of sealskins and other products, to remain available for
10 expenditure during the current and next succeeding fiscal
11 years.

12 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

13 Appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service shall
14 be available for purchase of not to exceed seventy-four pas-
15 senger motor vehicles for replacement only; purchase
16 of not to exceed six aircraft for replacement only;
17 publication and distribution of bulletins as authorized
18 by law (7 U. S. C. 417); rations or commutation
19 of rations for officers and crews of vessels at rates
20 not to exceed \$2 per man per day; repair of
21 damage to public roads within and adjacent to reserva-
22 tion areas caused by operations of the Fish and Wildlife
23 Service; options for the purchase of land at not to ex-
24 ceed \$1 for each option; facilities incident to such public
25 recreational uses on conservation areas as are not inconsistent

1 with their primary purposes; and the maintenance and im-
 2 provement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities under the
 3 jurisdiction of the Fish and Wildlife Service and to which
 4 the United States has title, and which are utilized pursuant
 5 to law in connection with management and investigation
 6 of fish and wildlife resources.

7 OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

8 ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

9 For expenses necessary for the administration of Terri-
 10 tories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under
 11 the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, for ex-
 12 penditure as authorized by law, \$7,020,000.

13 *For expenses necessary for the administration of Terri-*
 14 *tories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under*
 15 *the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including*
 16 *expenses of the offices of the Governors of Alaska, Hawaii,*
 17 *Guam, American Samoa, as authorized by law (48 U. S. C.,*
 18 *secs. 61, 531, 1422, 1431a (c), expenses of the Government*
 19 *of the Virgin Islands including the agricultural station, as*
 20 *authorized by law (48 U. S. C. 1405, 7 U. S. C. 386g),*
 21 *and expenses of the High Commissioner of the Trust Terri-*
 22 *tory of the Pacific Islands appointed pursuant to the trustee-*
 23 *ship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth*
 24 *Congress; compensation and mileage of members of the legis-*
 25 *latures in Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and American Samoa as*

1 authorized by law (48 U. S. C., secs. 87, 599, 1421d (e),
2 and 1431a (c)); compensation and expenses of the judiciary
3 in American Samoa as authorized by law (48 U. S. C.
4 1431a (c)) and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands
5 under the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204,
6 Eightieth Congress; care of insane as authorized by law for
7 Alaska (48 U. S. C. 46-50); grants to the Virgin Islands,
8 Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the
9 Pacific Islands, in addition to current local revenues, for
10 support of governmental functions; and not to exceed \$50,000
11 for personal services, household equipment and furnishings,
12 and utilities necessary in the operation of the several Gov-
13 ernors' houses; \$7,020,000, of which not to exceed \$811,865
14 shall be available for personal services: Provided, That the
15 Territorial and local governments of the Virgin Islands,
16 Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the
17 Pacific Islands are authorized to make purchases through the
18 General Services Administration: Provided further, That
19 appropriations available for the Administration of Territories,
20 including the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, may be
21 expended for the purchase, maintenance, and operation of not
22 to exceed four aircraft, 1 AK and 6 AKL type surface
23 vessels, and such minor vessels as may be required, for official
24 purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found
25 by the Secretary to be necessary in carrying out the pro-

visions of Article 6 (2) of the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress.

ALASKA PUBLIC WORKS

For an additional amount for expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 24, 1949 (Public Law 264), to remain available until June 30, 1955, ~~\$7,000,000~~ \$8,500,000, of which not to exceed ~~\$500,000~~ \$463,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, and of which not to exceed \$333,000 shall be available for personal services.

CONSTRUCTION OF ROADS, ALASKA

For construction of roads, tramways, buildings, ferries, bridges, and trails, including surveys and plans for new road construction; acquisition of lands or interests in lands by purchase, donation, condemnation, or otherwise; to remain available until expended, \$20,000,000, of which not to exceed \$2,493,000 shall be available for personal services, and of which not to exceed \$8,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF ROADS, ALASKA

For operation and maintenance of roads, tramways, buildings, ferries, bridges, and trails, ~~\$2,600,000~~ \$2,900,000 of which not to exceed \$1,935,840 shall be available for personal services.

1 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

2 The total of the amounts herein appropriated for con-
3 struction, operation and maintenance of roads in Alaska shall
4 be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein
5 made for operation and maintenance shall be available only
6 for the service of the current fiscal year.

7 Not to exceed ~~25~~ 20 per centum of the amount herein
8 appropriated for construction of roads in Alaska shall be
9 available for construction work by force account, or on a
10 hired labor basis.

11 CONSTRUCTION, ALASKA RAILROAD

12 For the authorized work of the Alaska Railroad, includ-
13 ing improvements and new construction, to remain available
14 until expended, \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That funds appro-
15 priated under this head may be transferred to the Alaska
16 Railroad Special Fund for purposes of accounting and
17 administration.

18 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ALASKA RAILROAD

19 The Alaska Railroad Special Fund shall continue avail-
20 able until expended for the work authorized by law, includ-
21 ing operation of facilities under the jurisdiction of the railroad
22 in Mount McKinley National Park; operation and mainte-
23 nance of oceangoing or coastwise vessels by ownership, char-
24 ter, or arrangement with other branches of the Government

1 service, for the purpose of providing additional facilities for
 2 transportation of freight, passengers, or mail, when deemed
 3 necessary for the benefit and development of industries or
 4 travel in the area served; and payment of compensation and
 5 expenses as authorized by section 42 of the Act of September 7, 1916 (5 U. S. C. 793), to be reimbursed as therein
 6 provided: *Provided*, That no one other than the general
 7 manager of said railroad, and one assistant general manager
 8 at not to exceed \$13,000 per annum, shall be paid an annual
 9 salary out of said fund of more than \$11,000.

11 VIRGIN ISLANDS PUBLIC WORKS

12 For an additional amount to carry out the provisions of
 13 the Act of December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 827), ~~\$1,000,-~~
 14 ~~000~~ \$992,970, of which not to exceed \$63,270 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That the estimated
 15 project costs specified in said Act of December 20, 1944,
 16 shall not constitute limitations on amounts that may be
 17 expended for such projects: *Provided further*, That no part
 18 of this appropriation shall be used for the waterfront development project on Saint Thomas, and the amount included in
 19 the 1952 budget estimates for this project is hereby made
 20 available for school and hospital facilities in the Virgin
 21 Islands.
 22
 23

1 ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary
4 of the Interior (referred to herein as the Secretary), includ-
5 ing teletype rentals and service; ~~\$2,000,000~~ \$2,154,911,
6 of which not to exceed \$1,890,798 shall be available for
7 personal services.

8 GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

9 SEC. 102. Notwithstanding any provision of law to the
10 contrary, aliens may be employed during the current fiscal
11 year in the field service of the Department for periods of
12 not more than thirty days in cases of emergency caused by
13 fire, flood, storm, act of God, or sabotage.

14 SEC. 103. Appropriations in this Act available for
15 travel expenses shall be available, for expenses of attendance
16 of officers and employees at meetings or conventions of
17 members of societies or associations concerned with the work
18 of the bureau or office for which the appropriation concerned
19 is made.

20 SEC. 104. Appropriations made in this Act shall be
21 available for expenditure or transfer (within each
22 bureau or office), with the approval of the Secre-
23 tary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement
24 or repair of buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equip-
25 ment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other

1 unavoidable causes: *Provided*, That no funds shall be made
2 available under this authority until funds specifically made
3 available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies
4 shall have been exhausted.

5 SEC. 105. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure
6 or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropria-
7 tion in this Act, in addition to the amounts included in the
8 budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression
9 or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threat-
10 ening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the In-
11 terior: *Provided*, That appropriations made in this Act for
12 fire suppression purposes shall be available for the payment
13 of obligations incurred during the preceding fiscal year.

14 SEC. 106. Appropriations made in this Act shall be
15 available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and
16 similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will
17 contribute to efficiency or economy; and said appropriations
18 shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activ-
19 ity in the same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30,
20 1932 (31 U. S. C. 686) : *Provided*, That reimbursements
21 for cost of supplies, materials and equipment, and for serv-
22 ices rendered may be credited to the appropriation current
23 at the time such reimbursements are received.

24 SEC. 107. Appropriations made in this Act shall be
25 available for services as authorized by section 15 of the

1 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) when authorized
2 by the Secretary; maintenance and operation of aircraft;
3 hire of passenger motor vehicles; examination of estimates
4 of appropriations in the field; payment for telephone service
5 in private residences in the field, when authorized under
6 regulations approved by the Secretary; and the payment
7 of dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library mem-
8 bership in societies or associations which issue publications
9 to members only or at a price to members lower than to
10 subscribers who are not members.

11 SEC. 108. The balances of all contract authoriza-
12 tions heretofore granted to the Interior Department or any
13 of its bureaus or offices, which remain ~~unused~~ *unobligated* on
14 June 30, ~~1951~~ 1952, are hereby rescinded, ~~except public~~
15 ~~works in the Virgin Islands.~~

16 *SEC. 109. Transfers to the Department of the Interior*
17 *pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Serv-*
18 *ices Act of 1949 of property, other than real, excess to the*
19 *needs of Federal agencies may be made at the request of the*
20 *Secretary without reimbursement or transfer of funds when*
21 *required by the Department for operations conducted in the*
22 *Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.*

TITLE II—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

REVOLVING FUND

For an additional amount for the revolving fund established under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, to provide for advances to the Virgin Islands Corporation as authorized by law, ~~\$1,800,000~~ \$2,595,000.

GRANTS

For payment to the Virgin Islands Corporation in the form of grants, for expenses incurred during the current fiscal year, as authorized by section 8 of the Virgin Islands Corporation Act, in the conduct of activities budgeted as predominantly nonrevenue producing, \$130,000: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1951, for estimated losses to be sustained during the fiscal year 1951, shall remain available for estimated losses to be sustained during the fiscal year 1952: *Provided further*, That an amount equal to the excess of grants for estimated losses for revenue producing activities over the actual loss for the fiscal year 1951 and the estimated loss for the fiscal year 1952 shall be transferred from the appropriation for "Grants" to the "Revolving Fund, Virgin Islands Corporation" and shall be merged therewith.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

During the current fiscal year the Virgin Islands Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available to it and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal-year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out its programs as set forth in the budget for the fiscal year 1952: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$130,000 shall be available for administrative expenses (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the Corporation, covering the categories set forth in the 1952 Budget estimates for such expenses.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

~~SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this Act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.~~

SEC. 301. No part of the money appropriated by this Act or made available for expenditure by the Virgin Islands Corporation which is in excess of 75 per centum of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be

1 employed by the Department of the Interior or the Virgin
 2 Islands Corporation during such fiscal year in the perform-
 3 ance of—

4 (1) functions performed by a person designated as
 5 an information specialist, information and editorial spe-
 6 cialist, publications and information coordinator, press
 7 relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert,
 8 television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity
 9 expert, or designated by any similar title, or

10 (2) functions performed by persons who assist per-
 11 sons performing the functions described in (1) in draft-
 12 ing, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or dissem-
 13 inating public information publications or releases, radio
 14 or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs,
 15 motion pictures, and similar material,

16 shall be available to pay the compensation of persons per-
 17 forming the functions described in (1) or (2).

18 SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in
 19 this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian
 20 employee of the Government whose duties consist of acting
 21 as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor ve-
 22 hicle (other than a bus or ambulance), unless such appro-
 23 priation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the
 24 compensation of employees performing such duties.

25 SEC. 303. No part of any appropriation contained in

1 this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any em-
2 ployee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that
3 would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one
4 hundred and fifteen, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time,
5 and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: Provided,
6 That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered
7 as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more
8 in personnel administration consisting of direction and ad-
9 ministration of the personnel program; employment, place-
10 ment, and separation; job evaluation and classification; em-
11 ployee relations and services; training; committees of expert
12 examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage
13 administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

14 SEC. 304. No part of any appropriation contained in
15 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
16 corporation included in this Act, shall be used to pay the
17 salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike
18 against the Government of the United States or who is a
19 member of an organization of Government employees that
20 asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United
21 States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization
22 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United
23 States by force or violence: Provided, That for the purposes
24 hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence
25 that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the

1 provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the
2 Government of the United States, is not a member of an
3 organization of Government employees that asserts the right
4 to strike against the Government of the United States, or
5 that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an
6 organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government
7 of the United States by force or violence: Provided further,
8 That any person who engages in a strike against the Govern-
9 ment of the United States or who is a member of an organi-
10 zation of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
11 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-
12 cates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates,
13 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force
14 or violence, and accepts employment the salary or wages for
15 which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained
16 in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction,
17 shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not
18 more than one year, or both: Provided further, That the above
19 penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution
20 for, any other provisions of existing law: Provided further,
21 That in cases of emergency, caused by fire, flood, storm, act
22 of God, or sabotage, persons may be employed for periods
23 of not more than thirty days and be paid salaries and wages
24 without the necessity of inquiring into their membership in
25 any organization.

1 SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation or authoriza-
 2 tions contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compen-
 3 sation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or posi-
 4 tion which may become vacant during the fiscal year begin-
 5 ning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall
 6 not apply—

7 (a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;

8 (b) to positions filled from within the agency;

9 (c) to offices or positions required by law to be
 10 filled by appointment of the President by and with the
 11 advice and consent of the Senate;

12 (d) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel;
 13 including orderlies and school teachers in the Indian
 14 Service;

15 (e) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2;

16 (f) to law enforcement officers:

17 *Provided further*, That when any department or agency
 18 covered in this Act shall, as a result of the operation of this
 19 amendment, reduce their employment to a figure not ex-
 20 ceeding 80 per centum of the total number on their rolls
 21 as of July 1, 1951, such amendment shall cease to apply
 22 and said 80 per centum figure shall become a ceiling for
 23 employment during the fiscal year 1952 and if exceeded
 24 at any time during fiscal year 1952 this amendment shall
 25 again become operative.

1 *SEC. 305. In order to effect reductions equivalent to ten*
2 *per cent or more in personal service budget estimates,*
3 *excepting operation and maintenance personnel, the following*
4 *reductions below the 1952 budget estimates have been made*
5 *in the following appropriations in the amounts indicated:*

6 *Enforcement of Connally Hot Oil Act, \$15,330.*

7 *Power and energy studies, New England and New*
8 *York, \$24,100.*

9 *Southeastern Power Administration:*

10 *Construction, \$499,980.*

11 *Operation and maintenance, \$115,200.*

12 *Southwestern Power Administration:*

13 *Construction, \$65,200.*

14 *Operation and maintenance, \$44,288.*

15 *Commission of Fine Arts, \$2,015.*

16 *Bonneville Power Administration:*

17 *Construction, \$931,941.*

18 *Operation and maintenance, \$131,561.*

19 *Bureau of Land Management:*

20 *Management of Lands and Resources, \$326,295.*

21 *Construction, \$5,000.*

22 *Bureau of Indian Affairs:*

23 *Health, education, and welfare services,*
24 *\$164,100.*

25 *Resources management, \$451,140.*

1 *Construction, \$316,896.*

2 *General administrative expenses, \$299,253.*

3 *Payments to Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations,*
4 *\$2,345.*

5 *Bureau of Reclamation:*

6 *General investigations, \$351,488.*

7 *Construction and rehabilitation, \$3,240,045.*

8 *Operation and maintenance, \$116,406.*

9 *General administrative expenses, \$521,797.*

10 *Geological Survey:*

11 *Surveys, investigations and research, \$1,495,-*
12 *000.*

13 *Bureau of Mines:*

14 *Conservation and development of mineral re-*
15 *sources, \$1,112,797.*

16 *Construction, \$12,588.*

17 *General administrative expenses, \$113,159.*

18 *National Park Service:*

19 *Management and protection, \$414,936.*

20 *Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical fa-*
21 *cilities, \$26,710.*

22 *Construction, \$105,000.*

23 *General administrative expenses, \$112,726.*

24 *Fish and Wildlife Service:*

25 *Management of resources, \$191,804.*

1 *Investigations of resources, \$187,014.*

2 *Construction, \$16,258.*

3 *General administrative expenses, \$75,369.*

4 *Office of Territories:*

5 *Administration of Territories, \$90,207.*

6 *Alaska public works, \$37,000.*

7 *Construction of roads, Alaska, \$277,000.*

8 *Operation and maintenance of roads, Alaska,*
9 *\$34,160.*

10 *Virgin Islands public works, \$7,030.*

11 *Administration, Department of the Interior:*

12 *Salaries and expenses, \$210,089.*

13 *Nothing in this section shall be construed to effect greater*
14 *reductions in personal services than have been made in the*
15 *individual appropriation paragraphs in this Act.*

16 This Act may be cited as the "Interior Department
17 Appropriation Act, 1952."

Passed the House of Representatives May 2, 1951.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

82^d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3790

[Report No. 499]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

MAY 3 (legislative day, MAY 2), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JULY 3, 1951

Reported with amendments

Stat. 874), is amended to read as follows: "When the general fund in the Treasury has been fully reimbursed for the expenditures which were made charges against the Oregon and California land-grant fund, said 25 percent shall be covered annually, on or after June 30, into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts'."

Mr. CORDON also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3793, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. ECTON submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, the following amendment; namely, on page 13, after line 19, insert the following: "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for construction or repair of the Tongue River Indian Reservation electric line, Montana, but the Secretary is hereby authorized to enter into a reimbursable contract with the Tongue River Electric Cooperative, Inc., Montana, with respect to maintenance, operation, and subsequent transfer of ownership of said line."

Mr. ECTON also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3790, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of

the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Francis P. Matthews, of Nebraska, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Ireland.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. STENNIS:

Address entitled "We Must Be Strong," delivered by him before the Mississippi division of the American Legion Convention at Biloxi, Miss., June 17, 1951.

Editorial entitled "Coming Out of the Doldrums," published in the Delta Democrat-Times of Greenville, Miss., on June 7, 1951, relating to progress in Mississippi.

Editorial entitled "Dividend of Candor," published in the Washington Post of July 4, 1951, relating to the statement by the Senate Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations at the conclusion of the MacArthur hearings.

By Mr. TAFT:

Address delivered by him to the Republicans of Indiana, at Indianapolis, Ind., June 23, 1951.

By Mr. DUFF:

Address delivered by him on July 4 at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, on the occasion of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

By Mr. NIXON:

Statement prepared by him with reference to the moral rearmament meeting in Los Angeles, Calif., July 5, 1951.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Statement entitled "The Code of the Civil Servant," prepared by the Civil Service Employees' Association.

Editorial entitled "Let's Keep Our Guard

Up," published in the Washington Star, with reference to the foreign policy of the United States.

Correspondence between himself and Miss Ellen J. Jeffs, of Arlington, Va., relating to inflation.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Address entitled "The World Does Get Better," delivered by Dr. William C. Cope, at the commencement exercises of Ithaca College, in Ithaca, N. Y., June 2, 1951, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

Article entitled "Open House in Germany," published in the magazine Freedom and Union, for May 1951, discussing American libraries in Germany.

By Mr. KEM:

Letter entitled "The Biter Bitten," relating to socialism and the Kem amendment, published in the Washington Times-Herald of July 5, 1951.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article relating to the war-orphan problem and the Displaced Persons Act, written by Miss Frances Spatz, and published in the June 17, 1951, issue of the American Weekly.

Article relating to the necessity to support and strengthen the United Nations, by Pierce Butler, Jr., published in the Federalist.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

An article entitled "Fast Amortization," from the Wall Street Journal of July 5, 1951.

COMPARISON OF SUGAR ACT OF 1948 WITH PROVISIONS OF SENATE BILL 1694

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, some days ago there was published a newspaper article dealing with the sugar price support. The statement was made in the article that the sugar price support was the costliest of all agricultural support programs. There is now pending before the Senate, Senate bill 1694, which provides for an extension of the Sugar Act. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement showing a comparison of the Sugar Act of 1948 with provisions of Senate bill 1694, and also a table showing the sugar quotas available to the various countries under the two acts.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of Sugar Act of 1948 with provisions of S. 1694

	Present law	S. 1694
A. Quotas (sec. 202 of act and sec. 1 of S. 1694):		
1. Domestic areas.....	Domestic beet sugar..... 1,800,000 Mainland cane sugar..... 500,000 Hawaii..... 1,052,000 Puerto Rico..... 910,000 Virgin Islands..... 6,000	Domestic beet sugar..... 1,800,000 Mainland cane sugar..... 500,000 Hawaii..... 1,052,000 Puerto Rico..... 1,080,000 Virgin Islands..... 12,000
2. Republic of Philippines.....	952,000	No change.
3. Other foreign countries.....	After deducting the foregoing fixed quotas, the balance of the annual consumption estimate is distributed as follows:	After deducting the foregoing fixed quotas the balance of the annual consumption estimate would be distributed as follows:
	Area: Percent Cuba..... 93.64 Full-duty countries (all foreign countries except Cuba and Philippines)..... 1.36	Area: Percent Cuba..... 93 Full-duty countries (all foreign countries except Cuba and Philippines)..... 4
4. Proration of quota for full-duty countries.....	Required to be prorated to 27 countries in accordance with prorations made in 1936.	95 percent would be prorated on the basis of importations during the years 1948, 1949, and 1950 to each country which supplied 2 percent or more of the average importations for those years (this means 6 Latin-American countries). 5 percent would be held as a reserve for other full-duty countries of which no more than one-fifth may be imported from only 1 country.
5. Minimum quota for Cuba.....	Cuba, in effect, is guaranteed a minimum quota equal to 28.6 percent of the total requirements when this total falls below 7,400,000 tons. The quotas for domestic areas are required to be reduced if necessary to provide this minimum quota.	Cuba would receive 28.6 percent of the total consumption estimate if such estimate is 7,400,000 short tons of sugar or less and a flat quantity of 2,116,000 short tons when the total consumption estimate exceeds 7,400,000 short tons. The quotas for domestic areas would be reduced if necessary to provide for this minimum quota.

Comparison of Sugar Act of 1948 with provisions of S. 1694—Continued

	Present law	S. 1694
B. Quota deficits (sec. 204 of act and sec. 2 of S. 1694):		
1. Domestic areas and Cuba.....	Determination can be made for current year only and prorated to other domestic areas and Cuba on the basis of quotas then in effect.	Deficits known to be in prospect may be declared prior to commencement of new calendar year. No change in manner of participation in deficit except if any area cannot supply its portion, then to such other areas as the Secretary may determine.
2. Republic of Philippines.....	Prorated 95 percent to Cuba and 5 percent to full-duty countries.	96 percent prorated to Cuba and 4 percent to full-duty countries. (Same as new distribution of basic quota, A-3 above.) If any area cannot supply its portion then to such other areas as the Secretary may determine.
3. Full-duty countries.....	No provision.....	To Cuba and if Cuba cannot supply to other areas as the Secretary may determine.
4. Deficits in share of quota for individual full-duty countries.	Deficits cannot be determined until Sept. 1 of any calendar year and then must be apportioned to countries which have filled their prorations on that date.	Deficits may be determined at any time and may be apportioned to other full-duty countries on such basis as the Secretary determines is required to make the sugar available.
C. Limitation on refined sugar from full-duty countries (sec. 207 of act and sec. 3 of S. 1694).	All sugar from full-duty countries except prorations resulting from the Philippine deficit may be entered in direct consumption form.	The quota for full-duty countries could be filled in direct consumption form only to the extent that it could be so filled under the 1948 act except that each country is permitted to enter an amount equal to the average amount of such sugar entered during 1948, 1949, and 1950.
D. Termination of act (sec. 411 of act and sec. 4 of S. 1694).	Terminates Dec. 31, 1952.....	Termination date extended to Dec. 31, 1956.
E. Termination of sugar tax (sec. 3508 of Internal Revenue Code and sec. 5 of S. 1694).	Terminates June 30, 1953.....	Extended to June 30, 1957.

Sugar quotas under the Sugar Act of 1948 and proposed extension with total requirements of 8,250,000 short tons, raw value and deficits prevailing on June 19, 1951

[Short tons, raw value]

Area	Act of 1948			Proposed extension		
	Basic	Proration of Philippine deficit	Adjusted quotas	Basic	Proration of Philippine deficit	Adjusted quotas
Domestic beet.....	1,800,000	-----	1,800,000	1,800,000	-----	1,800,000
Mainland cane.....	500,000	-----	500,000	500,000	-----	500,000
Hawaii.....	1,052,000	-----	1,052,000	1,052,000	-----	1,052,000
Puerto Rico.....	910,000	-----	910,000	1,080,000	-----	1,080,000
Virgin Islands.....	6,000	-----	6,000	12,000	-----	12,000
Philippines.....	982,000	(200,000)	782,000	982,000	(200,000)	782,000
Cuba.....	2,959,200	190,000	3,149,200	2,711,000	192,000	2,903,000
Other foreign countries:					(¹)	
Dominican Republic.....	5,468	2,696	8,164	29,469	2,493	31,962
El Salvador.....	6,730	-----	6,730	4,416	-----	4,416
Haiti.....	756	373	1,129	2,850	211	3,061
Mexico.....	4,946	2,438	7,384	12,231	1,034	13,265
Nicaragua.....	8,380	-----	8,380	8,353	-----	8,353
Peru.....	9,113	4,493	13,606	50,031	4,232	54,263
Others.....	5,407	-----	5,407	5,650	-----	5,650
Subtotal.....	40,800	10,000	50,800	113,000	8,000	121,000
Total.....	8,250,000	-----	8,250,000	8,250,000	-----	8,250,000

If prorated as in 1951, to the countries which shipped raw sugar in 1949 and 1950 in proportion to their basic quotas

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the agreement entered into on Monday last, the Interior Department appropriation bill, 1952, House bill 3790, is the unfinished business, and the Chair lays the bill before the Senate.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Interior Department appropriation bill, now the unfinished business of the Senate, totals—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator permit the Chair to have the clerk state the first amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. I was about to ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not necessary. It is automatic.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 2, line 2, after the word "only", to strike out "\$174,000" and insert "\$158,670, of which not to exceed \$137,970 shall be available for personal services."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the estimates considered by the committee total \$564,186,000. The committee recommends appropriations of \$520,082,307, which amount is \$23,317,807 more than recommended by the House. It is \$58,605,518 less than the appropriation for the fiscal year 1950, after the reductions under section 1214 of the 1951 General Appropriation Act, and \$44,103,693 less than the 1952 budget estimates.

The Department of the Interior is charged with the preservation and development of the natural resources of the Nation of which the United States has title. Hearings on the bill began on May 8 and were concluded on June 6. The index to the hearings shows that

more than 250 witnesses were heard. The total number of printed pages of testimony is 2,232. Mr. President, this bill has received very careful scrutiny by the subcommittee.

It may interest the Senate to know that up to this date the total of the 1952 budget estimates received by Congress is \$84,382,557,427. Included in that amount, of course, are the permanent appropriations, such as those for the payment of interest on the public debt. By way of comparison, the budget estimates for the bill which came to our committee amounted to \$564,186,000. The committee has allowed \$520,082,307. On a percentage basis, the amount proposed to be appropriated for the Department of the Interior is less than two-thirds of 1 percent of the total appropriations which the Bureau of the Budget has requested Congress to consider. If the bill covered 1 percent of the total amount of the budget estimates, the appropriation provided by the bill would be \$843,000,000. It is actually \$520,000,000, which amounts to sixty-two one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total contained in the budget estimates. I mention this fact because it seems to me that people lose sight of the importance of maintaining agencies of Government which administer and develop our natural resources.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The subcommittee gave the bill very careful scrutiny and worked very diligently. Practically every amendment and every provision of any importance were carefully considered and argued very extensively and intensively by the members of the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. The careful hearings and discussions in the subcommittee first, and then in the full committee, resulted in the bill which is now pending before the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. The chairman of our committee has stated the situation accurately. We devoted much time to a detailed consideration of every item contained in the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Not only did the full committee give consideration to each amendment and provision, but each item in the bill was thoroughly discussed before any action was taken.

Mr. McKELLAR. I omitted to mention that fact, but the Senator from Arkansas is entirely correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to make the observation that in my brief experience and service on the Committee on Appropriations I have never before known the committee to be so diligent and to go over an appropriation bill so carefully as it went over the bill we are now considering. It considers all appropriation bills in much the same way, with the result that we are able in some cases to make some intelligent reductions in the amounts which have been requested by the Bureau of the Budget, while in others we are able to confirm the Budget Bureau's recommendations by the facts and fully justify the amounts which are being appropriated.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Arkansas has made a very accurate statement. It is exactly what occurred in the committee.

There is one further action taken by the committee which I wish to call to the attention of the Senate. It will be remembered that in the case of the independent offices appropriation bill the Senate recommitted the bill to the committee, with directions to make a 10-percent reduction in the budget estimates for personal services. The motion was adopted by a substantial vote on the floor of the Senate. The Appropriations Committee is a servant of the Senate; and to carry out the directive we have gone through every personal-service item included in the budget estimates with respect to the Department of the Interior.

A faithful servant, however, must direct the attention of its master to the fact that serious errors could creep in by reason of a sweeping cut of that kind. In making the proposed reductions in the bill the committee felt that the Department of the Interior is charged with the responsibility of operating and maintaining large power and irrigation projects, transmission lines for the distribution of power from Government-owned dams, hospitals for Indians, schools for Indians, the Alaska Railroad, and the national parks, all of which operate on a 24-hour-day basis. For that reason the committee deemed it entirely proper to segregate the operating personnel from the supervisory personnel of the Department. In so doing, we arrived at the following figures:

The total amount in the budget estimates for personal services of all kinds was \$171,147,495. Within that amount there is a total of \$53,077,219 for operating and maintenance personnel, leaving an estimate of \$117,370,276 for administrative, supervisory, clerical, and other personnel, not engaged in operation and maintenance. The committee made a reduction of 10 percent in the latter amount, which represents a total

of \$11,382,399 below the budget estimate. We have carried out the spirit and intent of the instructions given to us by the Senate, modifying them with respect to operations involving 24-hour service, which would not permit of a 10-percent reduction. Such action was taken by the committee, in lieu of the Jensen amendment, which appeared in the bill as it came from the House and which has been stricken out by the committee.

I suggest that the clerk proceed to read the amendments, and, if it is agreeable to Senators, in the case of amendments which I happen to know are controversial, I shall ask to have them passed over.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that on July 20 last year the President issued a directive calling upon the various departments and agencies to resurvey all projects and to suspend operations on all of them which were not essential to the national defense. The Senator from Arizona is familiar with that directive, is he not?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that approximately \$96,000,000 worth of projects were suspended.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; that is not what happened. In the Bureau of Reclamation there was a total reduction of somewhat more than \$60,000,000. There may have been more than \$96,000,000 of cuts made throughout the entire Department.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the \$96,000,000 total related to both the reclamation and the rivers and harbors projects, combined.

Mr. HAYDEN. Flood control and rivers and harbors projects are not included in this bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think the cut in flood control and rivers and harbors projects was somewhat more than \$50,000,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. All told, the claim is that the total reductions amounted to \$96,000,000 plus.

Mr. HAYDEN. The blanket cut which was made last year, which was to be effectuated by the Department, provided that a certain amount of money had to be deducted from the funds used in its operations. In most instances, the construction projects were simply slowed down. However, I know of two small projects which were authorized last year, but on which the work was stopped. One of them was in Montana, and carried an appropriation of approximately \$4,000,000; and the other was a very worthy project at Jamestown, N. Dak., amounting to approximately \$2,000,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was not referring to the cuts in appropriations for the De-

partment of the Interior, which the Congress made mandatory. I was referring to cuts made as a result of the President's directive to resurvey the projects. In connection with that matter, I addressed an inquiry to the Army engineers, and from them I received a reply, dated January 15, 1951, in which it is claimed that \$96,800,000 worth of projects was suspended as a result of that Presidential directive, and they sent me an itemized statement listing the projects by States.

Mr. HAYDEN. That matter would be an entirely proper one to be brought up when the civil functions appropriation bill is before the Senate. However, we now have before us a bill dealing with an entirely different subject, over which the Corps of Army Engineers has no jurisdiction.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the event the committee recommends the inclusion of any of these projects this year, shall we be supplied in each instance with a resurvey and a statement of the reasons for including such projects in the budget?

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no item in this bill which was not estimated for by the Budget Bureau, and at a reduced rate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I asked that question because in January the claim was made that \$96,800,000 was cut out last year as a result of the President's directive. Yet I find that in the Budget Bureau's recommendations this year, some of the very same projects are now included, to the tune of \$280,000,000; and I understand that no resurvey has been made, except in one instance. There are approximately 82 projects thus included. I, for one, think the Department should furnish the committee with a statement of its reasons, in each instance, for including the project at this time, after once having taken it out.

Mr. HAYDEN. I can assure the Senator that none of the projects included in this bill was previously taken out. All that was done by direction of the Congress was to reduce the amounts of money for projects under construction. There are no new projects in this bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The bill has just come to us; and, of course, I have not had an opportunity to study it. So I simply assume that the Senator from Arizona is correct in what he has just said.

However, I know that in the budget this year many of the projects which were taken out last year are now included. The Department boasted of the \$96,800,000 which it took out last year, as the result of the President's directive. However, Mr. President, if we are going to have projects put back in this year, to the tune of \$280,000,000, I think we had better notify the President not to try again to do that kind of economizing.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Most of those projects come up in connection with the civil functions appropriation bill. That bill is now the subject of hearings before the committee. I now issue an invitation to the Senator from Delaware to appear before the committee and be heard by it, or to present any witnesses whom he desires to have heard by the committee.

No new projects are included in the bill now before the Senate, and we do not expect to include any new projects at all in the civil functions appropriation bill which is now before the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield, to permit me to request an insertion in the RECORD, in connection with this matter?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a copy of the letter which I received from Brigadier General Chorpene, the Assistant Chief for civil functions engineering projects, with which letter he submits a list of the projects which were suspended as a result of the President's directive, and in the second column he lists a number of the same projects which are now included in the 1952 budget requests, and gives the amount of the appropriation requested for each one of them.

I submit this letter for printing in the RECORD, in order that the committee and the Senate itself and the Congress may have this information available to it. As I have said before, if any of these projects is restored, I think we should be furnished with a justification for doing so. I understand that no justification has been submitted thus far, but many of the projects are merely put back into the budget at this time to the tune of \$280,000,000, whereas projects amounting to \$96,800,000 were removed last year.

There being no objection, the letter and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, March 15, 1951.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Reference is made to your letter of March 7, 1951, requesting additional information in connection with the curtailment of the river and harbor and flood-control programs in line with the Presidential directive.

The enclosed tabulation is the same as that furnished you in the letter of January 15, 1951, with an additional column added showing the status of work on projects not included in the 1952 budget and the amount included in the 1952 budget for those projects proposed for continuation during fiscal year 1952.

I trust that the enclosed tabulation will meet your present needs.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. CHORPENING,
Brigadier General, United States
Army, Assistant Chief of Engineers
for Civil Works.

River and harbor work suspended in fiscal
year 1951 (by States and projects)

	Value of work sus- pended in fiscal year 1951	Amount in 1952 budget
Alabama:		
Bayou Coden.....	\$4,000	(1)
Dauphin Island Bay.....	31,600	(1)
Demopolis lock and dam.....	1,000,000	\$4,500,000
Bayou LaBatre.....	62,700	(1)
California:		
Sacramento River 30-foot channel.....	1,987,000	(2)
San Diego River and Mis- sion Bay.....	750,000	510,000
Connecticut:		
Connecticut River below Hartford.....	175,500	(1)
New Haven Harbor.....	102,959	(1)
Stamford Harbor.....	53,619	(1)
Westcott Cove.....	21,000	(1)
Delaware: Rehoboth-Delaware Bays waterway.....	122,000	(1)
District of Columbia: Potomac River north side of Washing- ton Channel.....	75,000	(1)
Florida:		
Jim Woodruff lock and dam.....	2,000,000	7,000,000
New River.....	75,000	(1)
Tampa Harbor.....	100,000	(1)
Illinois:		
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers.....	622,150	(1)
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Min- neapolis, Minn.....	1,147,200	1,600,000
Ohio River open channel.....	215,000	175,000
Ohio River lock and dam construction.....	450,000	175,000
Louisiana:		
Calcasieu River and Pass.....	50,000	1,025,000
Gulf waterway (Plaque- mine-Morgan City).....	500,000	(1)
Maine: Portland Harbor.....	20,000	(2)
Maryland:		
Cambridge Harbor.....	122,000	(1)
Honga River and Tar Bay.....	41,143	(1)
Pocomoke River.....	5,530	(1)
Massachusetts:		
Barnstable Harbor.....	182,500	(1)
Wellfleet Harbor.....	45,100	(1)
Michigan:		
Black River Harbor.....	162,000	(1)
St. Marys River.....	1,371,000	750,000
Montana: Fort Peck.....	417,000	944,000
New Jersey: New York and New Jersey channels.....	85,000	1,414,000
New York:		
Great Lakes-Hudson River waterway.....	140,034	(2)
Hudson River.....	18,271	(1)
Northport Harbor.....	37,000	(1)
Jones Inlet.....	500,000	(1)
Ohio:		
Cleveland Harbor.....	2,513,000	1,000,000
Scioto River at Portsmouth.....	63,500	(1)
Oregon:		
Columbia River and Lower Willamette between Van- couver, Wash., and Port- land, Oreg.....	97,000	(2)
Columbia River and tribu- taries above Celilo Falls to Kennewick, Wash.....	259,000	(1)
Columbia River, Vancouver to The Dalles.....	304,280	(1)
Columbia River at Bonne- ville.....	765,784	(2)
Skipanon Channel.....	154,600	(1)
Coos Bay.....	375,600	(2)
McNary lock and dam.....	133,000	42,900,000
Umpqua River.....	8,320	(1)
Yaquina Bay and Harbor.....	77,477	(1)
Depoe Bay.....	57,000	(1)
Pennsylvania: Schuylkill River.....	3,500,000	1,900,000
Texas:		
Gulf waterway (Galveston district).....	916,000	800,000
Trinity River, Channel to Liberty.....	750,000	(1)
Virginia:		
Norfolk Harbor.....	645,000	(2)
York Spit Channel.....	110,000	(1)
Virgin Islands: St. Thomas Harbor.....	1,000,000	(1)
Washington: Olympia Harbor.....	180,000	(1)
West Virginia: Kanawha River.....	80,000	(1)
Total.....	24,831,867	

Flood-control work suspended, fiscal year
1951 (by States and projects)

	Value of work sus- pended in fiscal year 1951	Amount in fiscal year 1952 budget
Arkansas:		
Ozan Creek.....	\$53,700	(1)
Blakely Mountain Dam.....	200,000	\$6,000,000
Narrows Reservoir.....	75,000	200,000
Norfolk Reservoir.....	30,000	(2)
Nimrod Reservoir.....	140,000	(2)
Blue Mountain Reservoir.....	12,000	(2)
Bull Shoals Reservoir.....	500,000	14,660,000
Arizona: Tucson.....	500,000	(1)
California:		
San Antonio Dam.....	150,000	1,000,000
Whittier Narrows.....	250,000	5,000,000
Los Angeles County drain- age area (exclusive of Whittier narrows).....	1,675,000	6,085,000
Merced County stream group (Bear Creek Dam).....	140,000	265,000
Farmington Reservoir.....	214,000	214,000
Isabella Dam and Reservoir.....	395,000	4,975,000
Pine Flat Reservoir.....	1,635,000	8,685,000
Folsom Reservoir.....	600,000	6,985,000
Sacramento River, major and minor tributaries.....	135,000	(2)
Sacramento River (old pro- ject).....	608,000	1,000,000
Florida: Central and Southern.....	200,000	6,500,000
Georgia:		
Allatoona Reservoir.....	60,700	(2)
Clark Hill Reservoir.....	1,000,000	18,300,000
Idaho:		
Lewiston-Clarkston levees.....	25,000	(1)
Lucky Peak Reservoir.....	1,850,000	4,000,000
Illinois:		
Columbia drainage and levee district.....	100,000	(2)
Chouteau, Nameoki, and Venice.....	30,000	(2)
Degonia and Fountain Bluff.....	80,000	(2)
East Cape Girardeau.....	200,000	(2)
East St. Louis and vicinity.....	100,000	1,500,000
Grand Tower drainage and levee district.....	50,000	(2)
Sny Basin.....	2,100,000	(1)
Mounds and Mound City, pumping plant.....	225,000	(2)
Indiana:		
Evansville:		
Howell unit No. 2.....	500,000	(1)
Pescion Creek section.....	300,000	(1)
Indianapolis, Indiana Ave- nue Bridge.....	533,400	(1)
Lawrenceburg, relief well.....	100,000	(2)
New Albany, pumping plants.....	250,000	575,000
Vincennes, defer entire pro- ject, new start.....	600,000	20,000
Shufflebarger levee, entire project.....	645,000	(1)
McGinnis levee, entire project.....	645,000	(1)
Iowa:		
Red Rock Reservoir.....	566,500	(1)
Des Moines.....	349,480	(1)
Coralville Reservoir.....	2,811,000	(2)
Little Sioux River.....	625,000	(1)
Kansas:		
Hutchinson.....	1,706,134	(1)
Wichita and Valley Center.....	1,081,000	(2)
Missouri River agricultural levees.....	735,000	2,312,000
Kansas Citys.....	1,095,000	4,500,000
Kanopolis.....	98,000	(2)
Kentucky:		
Covington, Licking River section.....	1,125,000	1,400,000
Jackson, defer entire project, new start.....	180,000	(1)
Newport, savings on con- struction.....	367,000	(2)
Hawesville, pumping plant.....	51,900	108,000
Wolf Creek Reservoir, pub- lic use facilities.....	100,000	3,000,000
Pineville, entire project.....	500,000	(1)
Asbland, defer section 3.....	1,115,000	2,900,000
Maysville, defer section 3.....	450,000	1,000,000
Dewey Reservoir, public use facilities.....	76,200	(2)
Louisiana:		
Aloha-Regolette.....	325,000	(2)
Bayou Rapides.....	100,000	(2)
Bayou Teche and Vermilion river.....	120,000	(2)
Red River levees and bank stabilization.....	500,000	(2)
Shreveport.....	180,000	(1)
Natchitoches Parish.....	26,312	(1)

Footnotes at end of table.

¹ No work under way.

² Being carried on during fiscal year 1951 under a cur-
tailed program.

³ For planning only.

Flood-control work suspended, fiscal year 1951 (by States and projects)—Continued

	Value of work suspended in fiscal year 1951	Amount in fiscal year 1952 budget
Maryland:		
Savage River Dam	\$300,000	(?)
Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va.	60,000	\$2,400,000
Massachusetts:		
North Adams	50,000	(?)
Adams	155,000	225,000
Bireh Hill Reservoir	20,000	(?)
Knightsville Reservoir	33,000	(?)
Tully Reservoir	26,000	(?)
Missouri:		
East Poplar Bluff	223,900	(?)
Clearwater Reservoir	22,000	(?)
Chariton River	1,461,000	(?)
Minnesota:		
Red River of the North	1,464,820	700,000
Red Lake River, including Clearwater River	600,000	(?)
Nebraska: Harlan County Reservoir	1,025,000	3,344,000
New Hampshire:		
Blackwater Reservoir	35,000	(?)
Franklin Falls Reservoir	32,000	(?)
Surry Mountain Reservoir	10,000	(?)
New Mexico:		
Jemez Canyon Reservoir	200,000	900,000
Rio Grande floodway	709,000	\$25,000
New York: Davenport Center Reservoir	800,000	(?)
North Carolina: Buggs Island Reservoir	1,500,000	17,000,000
North Dakota:		
Baldhill Reservoir	41,350	(?)
Honme Reservoir	138,200	(?)
Garrison Reservoir	2,081,000	37,083,700
Beulah	21,348	(?)
Hazen	35,486	(?)
Ohio:		
West Fork of Mill Creek Reservoir	500,000	(?)
Burr Oak Reservoir	20,000	(?)
Dillon Reservoir	1,370,000	(?)
Muskingum Reservoirs	500,000	472,000
Delaware Reservoir	30,000	(?)
Rock Fork Reservoir	519,000	(?)
Roseville	540,000	(?)
Oregon:		
Milton-Freewater	116,000	(?)
Arlington, Alkali Canyon	174,880	(?)
Amazon Creek	315,000	(?)
Lookout Point Reservoir	3,102,793	16,633,000
Cottage Grove Reservoir	50,085	(?)
Dorena Reservoir	619,409	(?)
Detroit Reservoir	4,137,980	16,978,000
Coquille River	235,092	(?)
Pudding River	108,000	(?)
Oklahoma:		
Canton Reservoir	281,000	(?)
Denison Reservoir	792,000	400,000
Fort Gibson Reservoir	1,490,500	2,400,000
Great Salt Plains Reservoir	40,000	(?)
Hulah Reservoir	709,300	(?)
Oologah Reservoir	764,842	(?)
Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir	535,000	3,800,000
Wister Reservoir	283,900	(?)
Kaw levee	125,000	(?)
Oklahoma City floodway	450,000	(?)
Polecat Creek Reservoir	75,500	(?)
Bradens Bend	500,000	(?)
Pennsylvania:		
Swoyerville and Forty Fort	500,000	(?)
Williamsport	770,000	775,000
East Branch-Clarion River Reservoir	500,000	2,100,000
Conemaugh Reservoir	200,000	10,000,000
South Dakota:		
Fort Randall Reservoir	465,000	34,699,000
Oahe Reservoir	1,400,000	3,770,000
Texas:		
Texarkana Reservoir	2,700,000	4,500,000
Belton Reservoir	236,500	4,000,000
Benbrook Reservoir	53,000	339,000
Garza-Little Elm Reservoir	500,000	3,500,000
Grapevine Reservoir	259,000	(?)
Lavon Reservoir	64,000	1,200,000
San Angelo Reservoir	100,000	1,200,000
Whitney Reservoir	255,000	4,000,000
Hords Creek Reservoir	50,000	(?)
Tennessee:		
Memphis, Wolf River and Nonconah Creek	150,000	750,000
Center Hill Reservoir	40,000	480,000
Chattanooga	676,000	(?)
Virginia: Waynesboro	50,000	(?)
Washington: Mud Mountain Reservoir	8,300	(?)
Vermont: Union Village Reservoir	35,000	(?)

Footnotes at end of table.

Flood-control work suspended, fiscal year 1951 (by States and projects)—Continued

	Value of work suspended in fiscal year 1951	Amount in fiscal year 1952 budget
West Virginia:		
Wheeling-Benwood	\$500,000	\$75,500
Bluestone Reservoir	75,000	(?)
Sutton Reservoir	1,800,000	(?)
Total	71,948,061	-----

¹ No work under way.² Being carried on during fiscal year 1951 under a curtailed program.³ Planning only.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Delaware wishes to go into the matter, he should appear before the Appropriations Committee, which now is considering the civil functions appropriations bill, because the matter to which he refers has nothing whatever to do with the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this material will be available to the committee and to the Senate. If the Senator from Arizona wishes to have me submit further material in this connection, I shall be glad to do so.

So far as my appearing before the committee is concerned, let me say that I was informed that the projects were stricken out as being nonessential to the national defense program, but now I find that many of them are being revived and restored.

So I hope the committee will study the material and information and will ask the Bureau of the Budget or the Chief of Army Engineers why the projects are restored to the bill this year.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me ask the chairman of the committee whether there is included in the bill a single item which has anything whatever to do with the \$96,800,000 of reductions to which the Senator from Delaware has referred.

Mr. HAYDEN. I would be greatly surprised if there was.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, as I previously said, I think it well to have attention called to this matter before the civil functions bill is reported, for otherwise it might be reported with these projects included in it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it would be well for the Senator to appear before the committee before the bill is reported.

The Senator from Arizona has been a Member of this body for a long time, and I should like to ask whether he recalls when the Big Thompson project was postponed, at the beginning of 1942, in the interest of national defense.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, and it was a great mistake to postpone its construction.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Arizona was a Member of the Senate at that time, was he not?

Mr. HAYDEN. I was.

Mr. ANDERSON. The cost at that time would have been approximately \$30,000,000, would it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not recall the cost. However, I can refer to a similar project, namely, the Davis Dam. The Davis Dam, on the Colorado River, was under construction on the basis of a cost of \$55,000,000, for which the contractor agreed to do the job. Then the work was stopped. The contractor was paid liquidated damages for ceasing work on the job. The final cost of that project, however, is more than \$105,000,000, by reason of increased cost of labor and materials.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator from Arizona realize that many of these projects, regardless of whether the work on them is begun in the year in which they are authorized, cost a great deal more than the original estimates before the work is completed? In fact, sometimes the final cost is as much as three times as great as the original estimate. So putting a project over to a subsequent year is not always the cause of a rise or increase in the cost.

Mr. ANDERSON. But did not the Senator from Arizona point out that in the case of the Davis Dam, the work was under contract? The work would have been completed at that cost.

Mr. FERGUSON. However, does not the Senator also realize that these contracts are not firm contracts?

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, my—

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, they are not firm contracts only if Congress does not appropriate the money with which to carry them out; but if Congress had appropriated money to carry out the construction of the Big Thompson tunnel in Colorado, it would have been constructed for much less money, exactly as the Davis Dam would have been constructed at a great saving.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator appreciate that frequently plans and specifications are modified and new features added, which enormously increase the costs?

Mr. HAYDEN. No new features were added in building the Big Thompson tunnel, and no new features were added in connection with the Davis Dam.

Mr. FERGUSON. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Arizona is advocating that we eliminate no projects, and continue all projects in the same manner as if there were no emergency and we were not engaged in preparation for the defense of America?

Mr. HAYDEN. Serious mistakes were made at the beginning of World War II; and I am responsible for one of them, as much as anyone, because, when I brought before the Senate the Interior Department appropriation bill, I then stated that, if any money were appropriated in that bill for projects which would require the use of labor or materials needed in the prosecution of the war, it was not expected that construction of the projects would be carried out. I

made a false assumption, because it turns out now that such projects could have been completed during the war, as well as not, and we would have had the advantage of that much earlier returns upon this Government investment by the sale of electric power.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then, as I understand the Senator, he does not advocate eliminating or reducing any amount for public works projects during this emergency, and he believes that the United States will be better off to proceed full steam ahead on every one of such projects?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the Senator from Michigan is putting words into my mouth. I did not say every such project, but I do say that a project now under construction at the present contract rates, if stopped, and if prices then go higher, as they are doing, will cost more in the end, and that we had better proceed with the work.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, so far as this bill is concerned—I am not talking now about others, because we shall come to them later—I attended every hour of the committee sessions. My good friend the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] attended every minute of the sessions. I think he was there all the time, and I never saw anyone make a more vigorous or determined fight on a bill than did he on almost every item of the bill. He made a wonderful fight. He got practically everything he asked for.

I had hope that there would be no opposition on the floor to this bill, but that it should be passed without objection. It ought to be passed promptly and go to conference.

I repeat that I never saw anyone make a more determined and vigorous fight in committee on a bill than was made by my distinguished friend from Michigan. He did everything in the world which was possible for the Senator to do to reduce Government expenditures; and I frankly say that I felt very much as he did regarding many of the appropriations.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the Senator's kind words, but I must disagree as to my success. I am not so enthusiastic about the success of my efforts as the distinguished Senator from Tennessee apparently is.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Michigan had greater success in connection with this bill than he ever before had in his life, in connection with any other appropriation bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am trying to pin down the question of the Davis Dam. Was the Davis Dam not under a firm contract which would have brought about its entire completion?

Mr. HAYDEN. That was exactly the situation. There was a very fine construction company on the job, amply equipped and ready to prosecute the

work. What happened? Their machinery had to be left in the open, unused, throughout the war, and the labor and materials which ought to have gone into that dam were not applied. When a resumption of the work was brought about we had to pay the Utah Construction Co. not only liquidated damages for having moved off the job, but still more, for returning to the job; and in addition to that, we had to pay higher prices for materials, higher rates for labor, and so on, all the way through, until the cost was practically doubled.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Arizona knows that that experience has been repeated time after time in connection with such construction contracts, does he not?

Mr. HAYDEN. It did happen in numerous instances.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is the only point I desire to make. We have had experience of the kind referred to; and while we want to stop and try to stop work on projects which will interfere with the national defense, yet whenever we stop work on all such projects by slashing the appropriations for them and take over the contracts when the work of excavation has been done and before the concrete work can be poured, whenever the work is resumed, it then becomes necessary to do the excavating all over again, and all the money which may have been put into it will have been wasted. I think the long experience of the Senator from Arizona is very worth while when it comes to the consideration of such matters.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the argument which the Senator from New Mexico has just made, as to why we should have continued work under such contracts in World War II, or perhaps why we should continue them today, leads me to inquire whether the same argument could not be made, and whether it has not been used by millions of home owners and millions of small-business men who, upon the request and suggestion of their own Government in World War II suspended the construction of homes or some other projects until the war would be over and materials became more abundant, only to find that in a given case the same home cost them three or four times as much as it would have cost them had they proceeded to its completion at the beginning of World War II. So I say the Government is not the only one that is being penalized as the result of the inflation caused by the Government's own reckless spending.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The junior Senator from South Dakota desired to get a clear understanding of the projects to which reference was made by the Senator from Delaware. The projects to which he refers as having been eliminated from the expenditure program last year re-

lated to projects of the Army engineers, projects which are in the civil-functions bill, and they did not relate to projects which are now in the pending Interior Department bill. Is not that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. I assume so.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the assumption of the Senator from South Dakota is entirely correct. I assume there are two or three little items, which do not amount to much, in the civil functions bill. I say again to the Senator from Delaware that we shall be delighted to hear him, or to hear any witness he may wish to have heard by the committee, in regard to those items, or any other items. We want everything to be absolutely fair and square.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will yield, I may say the only testimony I could give the committee—and I should be perfectly willing and glad to go before the committee to give it—is exactly what I have said here, that the Bureau of the Budget struck out the items, as being nonessential to the national defense; and, from an examination of the budget figures, I note that those items have again been included. All I say is that if we are to comply with the budgetary requests by restoring items which were originally stricken out, as indicated by the list submitted by me, I think we should require a complete statement of the projects which have been resurveyed and have again been included. It is not my job to do that; it is for the committee. The committee should obtain the necessary data from the Director of the Budget.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I desire to call attention to certain items, which the Senator from Michigan and other Senators on this side of the aisle, as well as Senators on the other side of the aisle may consider to be vital, and to which we may propose amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before the Senator from Michigan does that, I may say to the Senator from Delaware, before he leaves that all the projects to which he has referred, are river and harbor projects and flood-control projects. They are not at all in this bill and have nothing in the world to do with this bill. We intend to do with the flood-control bill just what we have done in regard to this bill. No item is to be included, without having first been most carefully scrutinized, and a careful examination made of the evidence upon which it is based.

Mr. FERGUSON. The items to which I referred, and which I desire to call to the attention of the Senator from Arizona, are as follows:

Page 8, lines 12 and 13, Bureau of Land Management, management of lands and resources.

Page 13, lines 8 and 9, under the Bureau of Indian Affairs, construction.

Page 18, lines 21 and 22, under Bureau of Reclamation, construction and rehabilitation.

Page 27, lines 16 and 17, under the Geological Survey, surveys, investigations, and research.

Page 29, lines 11 and 12, under the Bureau of Mines, construction and development.

Page 30, lines 8 and 9, Bureau of Mines, construction.

Page 32, lines 22 and 23, under the National Park Service, maintenance.

Page 35, line 4, under the Fish and Wildlife, investigations.

Pages 37 to 39, lines 13 to 2, Office of Territories.

As I said, I should like to confer with Senators on the other side of the aisle as well as on my side, but I am not sure that we shall offer amendments to all the items.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will not, but that when he confers with Senators on his side of the aisle—

Mr. FERGUSON. And Senators on the other side.

Mr. McKELLAR. He will be willing to withdraw any amendments suggested, because I have never seen a measure that has received more careful attention than has the pending bill. I had hoped, as I told the Senator yesterday when I talked to him about it, that the Senate would pass the bill in 10 minutes. I have seen the time when such a thing was possible.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to go along with the chairman on this matter. I appreciate that we raised every point before the committee and fought it out in committee, but there are Senators on the floor who did not have the benefit of being present at that time who may want to offer amendments. I believe there are some Senators on both sides of the aisle who desire to give the subject consideration.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. In order that the matter presented by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] may be completely cleared up, may I state that I hold in my hand the letter which is addressed to the Senator from Delaware by Brig. Gen. C. H. Chorpene, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works. May I ask the Senator from Delaware if it is not true that the projects to which the letter refers are rivers and harbors and flood control projects included on the list accompanying General Chorpene's letter?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; that is correct. I said that in the beginning. But I am placing the material in the Record, because I think it should be available to the committee for study.

Mr. CASE. I think it will be very valuable to Members of the Senate, and I am glad the Senator is putting the documents into the Record so that we may consider them prior to the consideration of the civil functions bill.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I wish the Senator from Arizona would inform me as to who prepared this report. I invite the Sena-

tor's attention to page 23 of the report, relating to the dam at Palisades, Idaho. When I read this report I was hurt, as was almost everyone from the West who knows of the Palisades project that the committee cut out in toto the development of this essential project. But in viewing the report, as written, I am not dismayed or alarmed lest the whole project be cut out, because, as the Senator from Arizona well knows, the testimony was full and complete as to the dire need for more electrical power at the atomic-energy installation at Arco, Idaho, and the necessary supplemental water for 650,000 acres of the Nation's best agricultural land, plus flood control. In this report not one sentence is devoted to that gigantic atomic-energy project at Arco, Idaho. The report tells us that the Defense Electrical Administration has approved the development of Palisades as an essential project.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think the Senator is looking at the wrong committee print of the report. What he should examine is the final report, and he will find that changes have been made.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will further yield, does he agree with me that the committee made a dire mistake when it cut out entirely an installation on which \$3,000,000 has already been spent and in connection with which a town site has been erected? A transmission line has also been erected, and the town site is now developing. There are still technicians upon the ground at Palisades and at Idaho Falls to proceed with this extensive installation on which we have already spent approximately \$3,000,000, and which will, within 3 years, give us much-needed electrical energy and supplemental irrigation water for 650,000 acres of land, plus flood control for one of the most productive agricultural lands in America.

Is it not a case of being penny-wise and dollar-foolish, when, as the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] related a moment ago, we abandon a project, leave it open to the elements, subject to erosion and other damage, and thus ruin a vast project, much work on which has already been done? The Senator agrees with me, I am sure—

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Idaho has my entire sympathy, but when the matter was taken up in the full committee the majority of the committee did not see it that way. The subject may be discussed later.

Mr. WELKER. I assure the Senator of my cooperation. I know what long hours he and the other members of the committee have worked upon this matter. I shall scrutinize carefully the appropriations for other projects in view of the fact that a valuable installation such as the Palisades project has been deleted from the bill. It is unfair and unjust. If we are to develop any irrigation and power projects in America, the Palisades project should go ahead to completion.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendments at the top of page 2 adopted. The others may be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of the Interior—Office of the Secretary—Enforcement of Connally Hot Oil Act," on page 2, line 2, after the word "only", to strike out "\$174,000" and insert "\$158,670, of which not to exceed \$137,970 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 4, to insert:

CONSTRUCTION, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, to remain available until expended, \$342,020.

The sum of \$1,758,400, the unobligated portion of the \$1,850,000 appropriation contained in chapter V of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 911, 81st Cong.), under the heading "Department of the Interior, Southeastern Power Administration, construction," is hereby rescinded and shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this act.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] I ask that that amendment be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be passed over.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration," on page 3, line 2, after the word "area", to strike out "\$275,000" and insert "\$125,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "five" and insert "three."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Continuing fund, Southeastern Power Administration," on page 3, line 24, after the word "area", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That the following paragraph under the heading 'Office of the Secretary, continuing fund, power transmission facilities,' in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950—Public Law 350, Eighty-first Congress—is hereby amended to read as follows:

CONTINUING FUND

Continuing fund, power transmission facilities: All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy under the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), generated or purchased in the southwestern power area, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, except that the Treasury shall set up and maintain from such receipts a continuing fund of \$300,000, including the sum of \$100,000 in the continuing fund established under the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944 (57 Stat. 621), which shall be transferred to the fund hereby estab-

lished; and said fund of \$300,000 shall be placed to the credit of the Secretary and shall be subject to check by him to defray emergency expenses necessary to insure continuity of electric service and continuous operation of the facilities.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this amendment should go over, because it relates to a continuing fund. The amendment which appears on page 4 relates to power transmission facilities in both the Southeastern and Southwestern Administrations. The same question was under consideration on the floor of the House, and a similar amendment was ruled out because it was legislation on an appropriation bill. A subsequent amendment somewhat modifying the first was ruled out because it was not germane. In the course of the debate it was stated, quoting from Cannon's Precedents under germaneness, as follows:

If the effect of striking out the language so affects the scope and import of the text as to present a subject different from that under consideration, it is not germane.

Later, is this quotation from page 12 of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives:

While an amendment proposing to strike out cannot ordinarily be ruled out of order as not germane, if the effect of striking out the language so affects the scope and import of the text as to present a subject different from that under consideration, it is not germane.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD extracts from the House proceedings appearing on pages 4405 to 4407, inclusive. I am sure this point of order will be extensively argued in the Senate and that what occurred in the House will be appropriate to the discussion.

There being no objection, the extracts from the House proceedings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Clerk read as follows:

"CONTINUING FUND, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION"

"All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy under the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), generated or purchased in the southeastern power area, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, except that the Treasury shall set up and maintain from such receipts a continuing fund of \$50,000, and said fund shall be placed to the credit of the Secretary, and shall be subject to check by him to defray emergency expenses necessary to insure continuity of electric service and continuous operation of Government facilities in said area."

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. TACKETT: Strike out the period on line 18, page 3, following the word 'area' and insert the following language: 'Provided, further, That all receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy under the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), generated or purchased by the Southwestern Power Administration, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, except that the Treasury shall set up and maintain from such receipts a continuing fund of \$250,000, and said fund

shall be placed to the credit of the Secretary, and shall be subject to check by him to defray emergency expenses necessary to insure continuity of electric service and continuous operation of Government facilities in said area, and that no funds from such receipts herein appropriated or previously authorized or appropriated shall be subject to check by the Secretary for the purchase of power or lease of transmission facilities, except under these limitations relating to emergency conditions.'"

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and that the language used changes the purpose of the legislation to be considered.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arizona desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TACKETT. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

I contend, Mr. Chairman, that this is a limitation upon legislation and that it is germane to the provisions of the bill, because the Southwestern Power Administration and the Southeastern Power Administration are both authorized under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, and that this amendment places the Southwestern Power Administration and other such agencies under the Department of the Interior under the same provisions and entitlement so far as the continuing fund is concerned. It is certainly germane, Mr. Chairman, for the simple reason that both such agencies are set up under the Flood Control Act of 1944, and this is a limitation upon the legislation that is provided by this section of the proposal now before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk on the point of order and say that this \$300,000 continuing fund was originally adopted by the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate for the sole purpose of repair work and to purchase emergency power for a short time so that there would be a continuation of power. Due to the fact that the Committee on Appropriations originally adopted this item and put it in an appropriation bill, by the same token I contend it can be taken out of an appropriation bill, or limited as the gentleman from Arkansas is now attempting to do.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TABER. Yes, Mr. Chairman. This is a germane amendment to the language that already appears in the legislation. While this may be legislation, the other is legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order for the purpose of making a contribution for consideration. It seems to me that this violates a fundamental rule. Under the guise of a limitation or a negative proposal you cannot impose additional affirmative duties or powers or responsibilities. The amendment of the gentleman is affirmative in nature, and a limitation cannot be utilized for that purpose.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, if I may make one additional observation, I would agree with the majority leader except for one thing. I contend that the legislation of which he speaks in a former appropriation bill passed by the Congress in 1950 was not permanent legislation. Therefore, this amendment would be in order to restrict legislation that was not of a permanent nature.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] has offered an amendment on page 3, line 18, to a paragraph of the bill which has to do with the continuing fund of the Southeastern Power Administration. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] makes a point of order against the amendment. The Chair has had an opportunity to read and analyze the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas, which has to do with the generation or purchase of electric power by another agency than the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration. The amendment contains language that is clearly legislation.

In answer to the suggestion of the gentleman from New York, even though legislation may appear in an appropriation bill, that language cannot be amended by other language which adds legislation. Briefly, a proposition in an appropriation bill proposing to change existing law, but permitted to remain, may be perfected by germane amendments, but such amendments may not add legislation, and it is the opinion of the Chair that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas proposes to add legislation not authorized by law.

Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. TACKETT: On page 3, line 10, after the comma, strike out the words 'generated or purchased in the southeastern power' and the word 'area' and the comma in line 11, and strike out the last word of line 17, 'in,' and all of line 18."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas on the ground that it is not germane to the matter now under consideration and that it is legislation on an appropriation bill; and that it changes the scope and purpose of the bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Texas, the Speaker of the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. I simply desire to make this statement, that if the other amendment was subject to a point of order for the reasons given by the Chair, this one certainly stands on the same footing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Arkansas on the point of order.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I cannot see how the amendment I offer can be found to be other than a restriction on legislation of an appropriation bill. The pertinent portion of the provision is short. It reads:

"All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy under the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, * * * shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States."

The only wording that is being changed by this amendment is to limit legislation of the appropriation for the simple reason that the words "generated or purchased in the southeastern power area" are sought to be stricken out.

Section 5 of the Flood Control Act covers all agencies of the Department of the Interior. Therefore this amendment would merely restrict the language of this provision so as to provide that it would affect alike all the agencies doing business under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944. If there is such a thing as being able to restrict an appropriation bill, I cannot see why the amendment which I have offered is not admissible since it restricts the appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman completed his statement?

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman to withhold the point of order so that I may be heard for a period of 5 minutes?

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, we cannot withhold the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has refused to withhold the point of order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York may proceed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas, as I understand it, strikes out in line 10 the words "generated or purchased in the southeastern power area." The word "area" appears in line 14. And in lines 17 and 18 words "in said area." How it can be improper or be construed as creating legislation to strike out words is beyond me. It seems to me that any Member has the right to offer an amendment to strike out the whole or any part of the language, and this amendment is entirely in the nature of striking out specific words which appear in the paragraph.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard very briefly on this question?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. On page 3, starting on line 7, the bill provides:

"All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy under the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act * * * and so on 'shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States.'"

What we have here is a situation where the amendment would have the effect of widening the scope and purpose of the bill. At the present time it is limited to the southeastern power area, but if the amendment is adopted, then the provision would be applicable throughout the country. Cannon's Precedents Under Germaneness, volume 8, pages 2917 and 1921, states in part:

"But, if the effect of the striking out of such language so affects the scope and import of the text as to present a different subject from the one under consideration it is not germane."

So, Mr. Chairman, it would seem under the Precedents that the effect of the gentleman's amendment would be that it is not germane because it widens the scope and purpose of the bill.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard, to make but one further observation?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is pleased to hear the gentleman.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, my amendment does nothing except to strike a portion of legislation in the appropriation bill. It does that and nothing more, it is restrictive in nature and in its scope and therefore it is admissible. There is no question about the germaneness. No one has raised the question of it being germane. Therefore, the amendment is in order.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, my point of order is based on two grounds, one as to its germaneness, and second, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts may proceed.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The main language in this provision, as I see it, is in "the Southeastern Power area." The provisions are limited to one area. The striking out of language by this amendment extends it to other areas. There have been many rulings to the effect that even if an amendment is related to the bill or to the provision of a bill which is confined to one subject it is not in order to offer an amendment which

would widen the scope and purpose of the bill. We have such a precedent in the old Territories decision where a bill which was reported out of committee, having for its purpose the admission of one Territory to the Union, could not be amended by an amendment to the bill to admit two territories to the Union. It was held in the old Territories decision that such an amendment was not germane and would be subject to a point of order.

If the bill is reported out to admit two Territories, then an amendment to admit a third one would be in order. But this is confined to one subject.

It seems to me that in addition to the other reasons, the line of rulings to which I have called attention would apply to the point of order raised by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] offered an amendment on page 3 to certain language in lines 10 and 11 and 17 and 18 of the paragraph of the bill "Continuing fund, Southeastern Power Administration." The amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] would, as pointed out by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] in his able discussion of the point, enlarge the scope of the language contained on page 3 of the bill.

Cannon's Procedure in the House, on page 12, in the last paragraph on the page, reads:

"While an amendment proposing to strike out cannot ordinarily be ruled out of order as not germane, if the effect of striking out the language so effects the scope and import of the text as to present a subject different from that under consideration, it is not germane."

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] clearly enlarges the scope of the language contained on page 3 beginning in line 7.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] makes a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation and is not germane. The Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order made by the gentleman from Washington on the grounds which the Chair has stated. The point of order is sustained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be automatically passed over. The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction, Southwestern Power Administration," on page 5, line 4, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$3,375,000" and insert "\$2,314,400, of which not to exceed \$586,800 shall be available for personal services, and", and in line 8, after the word "granted", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That this appropriation shall not be expended for the construction of facilities designated as comprising the western Missouri project."

THE CHRISTIAN VIEW OF PROPERTY

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, it has been my policy not to break in on debate on a vital bill with discussion of a subject not germane to the pending business, but in view of the fact that the committee did not report this bill until this morning, and, under the rules of the Senate, it could be required to lie over 1 day, that a gentlemen's agreement was entered into that the bill could be brought up, a preliminary statement could be made by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], chair-

man of the subcommittee, and that there would be no vote today on any controversial amendment, I should like to address the Senate on another subject. The distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has just requested that the other amendments go over until tomorrow, when we hope to have a larger attendance, and perhaps we will have an opportunity to finish the bill this week. I sincerely trust we can finish the bill this week because the Senate has passed but two appropriation bills. We have not even received conference reports on those two bills. Some of the most difficult and controversial bills are yet to be considered. So the chairman of the subcommittee very kindly informed me that if I wished to carry out the plan I announced last Saturday, of addressing the Senate on Tuesday of this week on the history of property rights, he would have no objection to my advancing it to today.

Mr. President, the members of our breakfast group know how I admire the patriarch and ancient desert chief, Job. Some of the passages in Job are among the most brilliant writings of all literature. In my opinion the philosophy of Job is immortal. He referred to the fact that "some remove the landmarks," and one of the statements of Holy Writ that I frequently like to repeat is:

Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set.

In the changing world in which we now live there are many seeking to remove ancient landmarks. In Virginia, and I assume in every other State of the Union, it is a criminal offense to remove a property landmark. It is not yet a criminal offense to try to remove the ancient landmark of property rights and to set up in its place a program of socialism or communism, provided only that doctrine is not coupled with the program of overthrowing the government by force.

So, Mr. President, before action on the very vital Defense Production Act is completed, and in a period when we are pouring out lavishly our treasure in opposition to the enemies of our form of government and our inherited institutions, I thought it might not be inadvisable to take a little of the time of the Senate to discuss the history of property rights, and then try to draw from that history some factual applications to present problems.

As I announced last Saturday, the subject of my remarks is The Christian View of Property. My remarks will be rather academic for the most part, but I hope they will not be too tedious, because we need now and then to restate and redefine even the most fundamental of our governmental principles.

In an arresting article entitled "Acts of Faith for a Time of Peril," Dr. Raymond B. Fosdick said:

We are even now presented with a problem of delicate balance: how to win in our struggle with totalitarianism and at the same time preserve those ideals and standards, those "great things of the human spirit," without which a victory would be ashes. Our adversaries kill the humane tradition wherever

they can; it is their chief enemy. Our concern must be that in fighting this barbarian concept—this Alaric of the twentieth century—we do not inflict so serious a wound upon the inner life of our country that, though barbarism is conquered without, it finds a low resistance within.

Previously in that article Dr. Fosdick had called attention to the fact that at the time that the Goths were destroying Rome, Roman law, and Grecian culture, and plunging the civilized world into what historians called the Dark Ages, a devout and scholarly Catholic priest was preparing in the land that gave to the world the Christian religion a Latin translation of the Bible, later known as the Vulgate. And then he called attention to the rebirth of the arts and sciences, referred to as the Renaissance, in which the higher and nobler aspirations of human nature, in keeping with the teachings of the Bible as translated by St. Jerome, found a powerful and enduring expression.

Every student of political science who has likewise been a student of history is aware of the fact that all personal freedom, economic security, and social progress are keyed to the central meaning of property. But there are many in these confused times who do not clearly see through the shadows that surround us the Christian view of property or realize that it is the fundamental aim of communism to destroy that concept, not on the battlefield but in the minds and hearts of men.

Those familiar with the Bible and who accept it as the revealed word of the true God, know that there are many instances in the Old Testament confirming the right to own property. Whether or not the story in Genesis of the Garden of Eden be accepted as an historical verity or an allegory, two facts stand out: First, Adam and Eve were given as their own possession a fertile part of the new universe; second, when they refused to live in conformity with God's laws and were told by the Angel with the Flaming Sword "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread," they at least had the assurance that in God's plan for mankind in a sinful world those who sweated to earn bread could keep it and not have it taken from them to be given to those who failed to produce. The lilies of the field that toil not and neither do they spin, are supported and adorned by God because they live in harmony with God's laws. But not so with man in a sinful world. In one of the Ten Commandments God directed Moses to instruct the children of Israel that they should labor 6 days in the week—as explicit a direction as the following injunction to keep the Sabbath Day holy.

In the well-known eleventh chapter of Hebrews, St. Paul said:

By faith, Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed.

Clearly, it was God's will not only to confer the right of private ownership of property upon Abraham in a new land but likewise that the land to be possessed by Abraham and his descendants should be used for the purpose of giving to the world the Christian religion and the Christian Bible.

Students of the Bible are well aware of the fact that when the Jews, who were God's chosen people, exercised their property rights in keeping with God's will, which included a gift of one-tenth of their income to the church, they prospered but when they did not he permitted them to be overcome by their enemies. In order that they might have a clearer conception of how a society should be organized in keeping with God's will, God gave to the children of Israel, through their leader Moses, ten fundamental commandments which are the foundation stones upon which all free governments have been organized. Those Ten Commandments contain two specific references to property ownership: First, "Thou shalt not steal"; second, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, his field, or his manservant, or his maidservant, his ox, or his ass, or any thing that is thy neighbor's."

Some misguided Christians confuse the act of the members of the first Christian Church at Antioch, when they pooled their property for the common good, with communism, forgetful of the fact that the act of the Antioch Christians was a supreme act of charity, whereas the pooling of property under communism is accomplished by force. Incidentally, the property experiment of the Antioch Christians failed; and there is not another reference to that type of property holding in the New Testament.

The history of civilization is the story of man's struggle for the protection of his property rights, clearly recognized, as indicated above, in the teachings of the Bible but likewise recognized in the teachings of Mahomet, Confucius, and Buddha, whose followers represent the three remaining great religious forces of the world.

Long before the birth of Christ the right to the private ownership of property was recognized in China. Long before the birth of Christ the right of private ownership was recognized in Greece and by the city-state of Athens, which for 900 years dominated the then civilized world. Before and after the birth of Christ, the right of private ownership was recognized by the statesmen of the Roman empire, whose outstanding gift to civilization was Roman law and Roman justice. After democracy had been destroyed in Rome following the assassination of Julius Caesar, the succeeding emperors exercised the power of life and death over their citizens but did not undertake to abolish property rights. But that did occur during the Dark Ages to which Dr. Fosdick referred when a feudal system, no longer subject to Roman law and Roman justice, suppressed the freedom of private ownership and with that loss went all other freedoms.

We now face another period of history in which there is a strong, well-organized, and determined force in the world bent upon the destruction of property rights as the fundamental first step to the destruction of all personal rights.

The world now lives in a time of the breaking of the nations. This century has seen the crumbling of ancient empires, the emergence of brazen states founded upon colossal power and arbitrary

force, rather than upon morality and law. As the historian Arnold Toynbee has said, this age is a time of troubles, in which civilization is on trial. In particular, it is not only the structure of the civilized world which is threatened, it is the deeper, underlying principles and institutions of the social order which have been imperiled.

The attack is not only physical, but strikes at the spiritual, ethical, and legal aspects of society. The entire integrity of that body of relationships which represent the outgrowth of 2,000 years of Christianity, and of its influence in civilization, both in the east and in the west, has been challenged, assaulted, and overthrown in many areas of the world. The new dictatorships, like their fore-runners in other times and guises, have moved from conquest of the geographic regions they occupy to the domination of the bodies and minds of their captive subjects. They have progressively become more open and direct in their determination not only to rule men but to destroy the vestiges of long-held views of liberty. They seek to blot out of men's memories the reverence for the divine in life, the belief in the universal as well as the individual meaning of right and justice, and the recognition that if human life is to have a social meaning beyond that of might and material ends, the first and last aims of society must meet the tests of reason, of law and of judgment by those standards which are given by the Christian conception of existence.

It is this purpose, and this end, which have motivated the most malignant attacks upon both the outward observances and the inner significance of all religion, but especially upon those aspects of Christianity which constitute the cornerstones of western civilization and government. What begins as an onslaught upon the economic and political foundations of society ends inexorably as an attempt to destroy all that Christianity is, all that it represents and all that it implies concerning the nature and destiny of man.

It is almost a basic rule of the varieties of doctrine which promote the internal and external uprooting of the social heritage of laws and institutions in the Western World that the prime target of attention, the initial institution chosen for "liquidation," and the focus of unending deliberate agitation, as a supposed step to power, is that group of rights, relations and practices which compose private property. Indeed, it is a cardinal fact that nearly all theories of social revolution and of extreme ostensible reform either purpose the immediate abolition of private property as a condition of a new order or else intend its eradication as the outcome and goal of more slowly-paced, but equally effective elimination of property and its interlocked framework of rights.

Because a technique of confusion is a major instrument of the ceaseless criticism and the subtle as well as overt deprecation of property, there often is found a defensive, apologetic and uncertain response to such criticism upon the part of those whose sense the central meaning of property to security, prog-

tee responsible for legislative functions in the District of Columbia which bear no relationship to the national issues which affect our Nation. Congress must consider and act upon minor and relatively insignificant ordinances which waste literally thousands of man-hours. There is no reason at all why the government of the District of Columbia cannot be run in a democratic manner by the people who reside in the District of Columbia.

Home rule is necessary, not only to increase the efficiency of the Congress in the fulfillment of its major responsibilities but also for the welfare of the District of Columbia itself. In view of the fact that members of the District Committees have other responsibilities for themselves and their constituents, many District matters are neglected. More than neglect develops as a byproduct of this state of affairs. Washington, D. C., in spite of its beautiful boulevards, parks, and monuments, is lacking in the beauty of community spirit. It lacks the pride of citizen participation. The honor of being a first-class citizen is denied to nearly a million men and women. Washington has indeed become a politically paralyzed community.

This is a most unfortunate and serious problem in a nation which is the proclaimed champion of democracy. We cannot afford the luxury of undemocratic aberrations in our form of government.

THE SENATE LIBRARY

I have had the occasion to discuss the operation of the Senate Library with a number of former employees and also to read written recommendations submitted by others. One of the chief difficulties under which the Senate Library today operates relates to the fact that its personnel is chosen by patronage assignments and not by qualifications alone. Even within this context, however, it is still possible to make certain recommendations.

The Senate Library has vast and comprehensive source materials which afford Senators and committee staffs an opportunity to obtain valuable assistance on many subjects. The Library does need, however, an adequate cataloging and shelving system in order to achieve maximum efficiency and full access to the materials available.

It seems sensible to assign the positions of librarian and assistant librarian on a continuing basis so that there would be a continuity in policy with a minimum of change. This can be attained by assigning these two top positions to the majority and minority on an interchange basis. This is likely to encourage improved bipartisan service to the Members of the Senate at the same time as it stimulates a career interest on the part of the librarians.

It should also be possible for the librarian to establish certain standards for members of the staff, with job classifications and specific duty assignments. Future assignments to the library by Members of the Senate therefore would then be screened so that they would fall within the qualifications set forth for the job. Members of the Senate, I am certain, would be pleased to accommodate themselves to this suggestion in view of the improved library services that would flow from it. These improved services could well include research assistance.

The Library has the responsibility for distributing volumes of the United States Code, Statutes at Large, and other documents. Every Senator, therefore, should receive at the beginning of the year a letter describing the services which he can expect from the library, including a full list of the documents that will be distributed to him. This would tend to increase the utilization of the library Members of the Senate. It might also be desirable for the Senate Library each year to make a report to the Secretary of the

Senate describing the library's utilization and activities.

ELECTRIC VOTING

In presenting my proposal for automatic pushbutton voting by electricity, I am by no means forwarding an original or novel idea. The distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee has already presented in coherent and persuasive terms the need for mechanized voting as a solution to the greatest single waste of time in the Congress.

Every roll call in the Senate calls for Senate clerks to read all of the 96 names and it is estimated the procedure takes about 10 minutes as a minimum. This procedure is much more cumbersome in the House, where it is necessary to go through a list of 435 names and then repeat that process for Members who did not respond. Senator KEFAUVER, in his fine book, *Twentieth Century Congress*, as a result of his experiences in the House, describes a curious little show put on in front of the Speaker's table following the roll call when panting Members who have just arrived on the floor are attempting to have their presence recorded in the record by convincing the presiding officer that they did not hear their names called. It is estimated that this process in the House requires 45 minutes every time the question of a quorum or roll call vote is called for.

One result of the lengthy delay in the House in the course of a roll call is that fewer roll calls are therefore taken than would be in the public interest. The American people have a right to know how each Member of Congress votes so that they can better ascertain their Congressman's qualifications on election day.

I have not been able to ascertain the most recent statistics on the time consumed by the present roll-call method, but the statistics presented in Senator KEFAUVER's book for 1943, 1944, and 1945 are sufficient to demonstrate the problem. He estimates that in the 3-year average, 121.8 hours were consumed per year in the House of Representatives merely to tabulate. This can be translated into more than 24 legislative days on the basis of the typical legislative day running from noon to 5 p. m. The statistics for the Senate are an average of 79.5 hours consumed per year or nearly 16 legislative days. Since both Houses usually meet only 5 days a week, this means that in the House of Representatives alone, one entire legislative month a year is consumed in roll calls alone; and the Senate consumed 60 percent of that time.

To meet this problem, our State legislatures are repeatedly adapting themselves to a system of push-button voting. Today, 18 States are using automatic roll-call machines in one or both houses of the legislature to record their votes. My own State of Minnesota is included in that 18, and our experience vouches for the fact that the machines are accurate and save a vast amount of time in determining quorum calls as well as the results of contested issues. Furthermore, for the benefit of members of the legislature and visiting constituents in the gallery, the vote of each legislature is recorded on an illuminated board near the speaker's rostrum. The State legislatures have been using electric vote-recording machinery for more than 30 years, beginning with the Wisconsin Legislature in 1917.

Senator KEFAUVER makes an excellent suggestion in his book for the use of this automatic voting procedure in the Congress. In order to accommodate Members of Congress who may be in committee session or in their offices, he recommended an automatic recess of a few minutes to give the Members time to reach the floor, during which time the tally clerks would prepare the machines for use.

I urge favorable consideration of this proposal.

BROADCASTING AND TELEVISION OF CONGRESS

I urge the creation of a commission to develop plans providing for the broadcasting and televising of the proceedings of the Senate and the House of Representatives. This is not a new proposal. Representations were made to the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress in 1945 and in 1946 in support of such a plan, and radio engineers representing the National, Columbia, American, and Mutual Broadcasting Companies jointly submitted plans describing the facilities to be utilized.

Proceedings of numerous legislatures, both in the United States and abroad, have been and are being broadcast successfully. Recent interest in the broadcasts emanating from the United Nations and, most particularly, the deep and profound interest associated with the recent Senate crime investigation television broadcasts prove to me that the American people desire to become better informed about the operation of their Government and look upon radio and television as a way to become better informed.

The success of our democracy depends upon the consistent and careful concern in matters of public policy on the part of our electorate. The broadcasts of legislative proceedings would go far to help focus public attention on the issues and, just as important, on the debate and discussion processes associated with democratic policy making. Just as the American people have a right to know how the Members of their Congress vote, so do they have a right to hear and watch their representatives in action. This would serve as a very important channel for political education, both on the adult and student levels. It would develop a sense of participation on the part of the electorate and improve the accuracy and objectivity by which the American people keep themselves informed on public issues. Finally, and by no means least important, airing the proceedings in the Congress would increase the responsibility of the Members of Congress by making them increasingly aware of a large public audience and of the need for them to be businesslike, efficient, and conscientious. Those who do not meet that test would most likely and most correctly be separated from their responsibilities by the electorate on the designated election day of reckoning.

Differing proposals have been made to carry out this objective. One suggestion is that committee sessions alone be broadcast and televised on a regular basis; another, that the Federal Government own and operate a specific short-wave channel for the purpose of broadcasting the sessions of Congress; another, that the Congress should allow commercial sponsors to broadcast all or part of its proceedings on a regular sustained basis. I am not prepared specifically to suggest any one of these provisions or any others. I am prepared, however, to state the desirability of the objective and to urge positive action by the Congress to carry out the objective. To do this would not only improve our democratic processes at home, but also would be a living and practical demonstration of how our democracy works for all the world to see.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to note briefly the general contents of the statement. The first part of it deals with the resolution which it was my privilege to submit, Senate Concurrent Resolution 3, providing for a joint committee on the organization of the Congress. It calls for a continuous study of the legislative practices and procedures of the Congress, with the end in mind of solving the problems of this day. The next portion of the statement deals with congressional leadership, commit-

tee structure, and party responsibility. In my opinion, unless the mechanism for committee structure and party responsibility is improved and congressional leadership committees are properly organized, there is very little hope of being able to have a rounded program or an organized program of work and procedure for this body.

The next item in my statement relates to committee procedure. This particular portion of the statement pertains to whatever committees conduct investigations on the part of the Congress. I am deeply concerned over the lack of a formalized procedure for the investigating committees of the Congress. We have a sort of rule of thumb procedure, or a rule of expediency. I think the time has arrived to lay down, at once and for all, at least as a guide or rule, a series of principles and precepts which can guide investigating committees in their work programs.

Mr. President, I direct my attention in this statement to the matter of appropriations and the method in which appropriation bills are drawn, and the procedure which is utilized in the Senate, as well as in the House and in committees, of handling budgetary items.

I also refer in the statement Mr. President, to the matter of relevancy in Senate debate. Surely relevancy is fundamental to an orderly procedure. I think it is fair to say that most bodies which are faced with such perplexing problems as is the United States Senate or any other legislative body would like to have a degree of relevancy and of germaneness in the debate which is conducted.

I also address myself in the statement to the rule of cloture. Surely that is something which needs immediate revision; at least it needs the immediate attention of the standing committees of the Congress. In the statement I ask that it be given the attention of a joint committee.

I further commend to the attention of the Senate the portion of my statement dealing with private-bill procedure. A good deal of the time of this body is taken up with the details of considering private bills. I believe it is fair to say that it costs approximately \$200 to pass a single private bill. Many of them involve from \$25 to \$50 or \$100. Yet we spent \$200 in order to reimburse some person having a small claim against the Government.

I also point out, Mr. President, the importance of home rule for the District of Columbia. I think it is literally inconceivable that a body dealing with great problems of international relations, a body which says frequently that it is ready to join in a great debate, a parliamentary body that must consider the expenditure of billions upon billions of dollars of public funds, a body that must consider great programs of reclamation and resource development, problems of the regulations of our economy, tremendous tax bills, and all the other vital issues, should stand here as a glorified city council for the Nation's Capital. This may have been all right 100 or 150 years ago, when appropriations were in the millions and not in the billions of

dollars, and when the work of the Senate was limited to 2 or 3 months a year, but that day has gone, not only for now but for many years to come, and it appears to me that one of the minimum projects of the Congress should be to relieve itself of being a body of aldermen. I am sure no Member of the Senate would like to be addressed as "Mr. Alderman for the District of Columbia." He likes to think he is a United States Senator. So I suggest, Mr. President, that we give serious consideration to that question.

I also note the facilities of the Senate Library and its service, and also the matter of electric voting in the Senate of the United States, just as a means of conserving time.

Finally, Mr. President, there is a statement regarding broadcasting and televising the activities of the Congress. I realize that this is a very technical subject, and in view of the public interest in the activities of the Congress, and the great new interest which has come from televising certain activities of the Congress, I have suggested that a commission be appointed to determine how best we can utilize communications and study the methods or mechanisms of radio and of television to bring to the American people the work of their Congress, so that it will be understandable and meaningful to the rank and file of our citizens.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2395) to amend title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," to provide basic authority for certain activities of the United States Secret Service, and for other purposes.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, with reference to the pending bill which the Appropriations Committee has reported, one item of appropriation deals with the Bureau of Mines in the Department of the Interior. The policies of the Defense Minerals Administration, under the authority of Public Law 774, have been severely criticized by those engaged in the production of metals and minerals. I inquired today from the Defense Minerals Administration how many loans that agency had made under the provisions of the law written into the Defense Act under the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and I have been informed that as of today only one application for a minerals production loan has been approved, although the agency has received more than 700 applications, some of them coming from my home State. Naturally I was interested in what had been taking place with reference to these loans, and I have found that the Department of the

Interior has turned to a system of exploration contracts. For that I commend the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of the Defense Minerals Administration, Dr. James Boyd. When one door was closed to Mr. Boyd, he tried to walk through another door, and therefore he has established a system of exploration contracts.

As of the first day of July 1950, the Government's share of those contracts was \$2,219,539. In total amount they run to \$3,920,346. They involve 10 different minerals, and cover 14 different States. In view of the terrific shortage of metals and the great need for increased production for the national defense, I have tried to look into the causes of the delay in the use of the loan provisions which have been written into the law. I was anxious to ascertain whether the department had been using the provisions of the law, and if some remedy could not be provided.

At this time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD my letter of April 12, 1951, addressed to Dr. James Boyd, asking why he had not made greater use of the law, together with his reply, dated April 25, 1951, pointing out the difficulties which he was encountering.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 12, 1951.

DR. JAMES BOYD,
Administrator, Defense Minerals
Administration,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: I keep having people write me that they are unable to get action on their applications for defense production loans, and have had inquiries wanting to know if any applications have been approved. I of course, have been unable to answer these questions.

I would appreciate it very much if you would advise me how many applications have been received and how many have been approved, if these figures are available, and also the number received from my State and the number approved for New Mexico. I keep getting word that hundreds have been received but that there has never been a single one approved for a loan.

I feel that I should be able to answer the constituents who make these inquiries.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
DEFENSE MINERALS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 25, 1951.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLINT: Please pardon my delay in replying to your letter of April 12; unfortunately it arrived a day or so after I had left for the west coast and I have only just returned after an absence of over 10 days.

The policy of the Defense Minerals Administration with respect to loans has of course conformed with directives laid down by the Office of Defense Mobilization. To date, very few loans have been granted—in fact the Defense Minerals Administration has only approved one application in spite of the fact that as of last week we have received over 700. For your information, 23 of these applications were received from New

Mexico and one has been recommended for action.

The reason for this policy has been that the Office of Defense Mobilization has taken the stand that other means of assistance must be tried before loans—in other words, the use of the loan provision is to be only a last resort. Of course I am referring specifically to production expansion and not to the case where a prime contractor can apply for a loan under section 301 of the Defense Production Act.

In a directive of February 14 which was transmitted by a memorandum from Mr. Harrison, Administrator of the Defense Production Administration, instructions are quite specific. It is stated that direct loans should be reduced to the minimum and that they should be available only as a last resort in those instances where financial aid is not obtainable otherwise. Furthermore, it is also stated that guaranteed loans should be restricted primarily to working capital loans and/or short-term capital loans.

In accordance with these instructions, the Defense Minerals Administration is converting over many of the loan applications to procurement contracts, and in some instances where it is possible to do so, the conversion is to the exploration-type contract. In view of the complexity of loan procedures, such action seems desirable. Loans involve the checking of credit and as you undoubtedly appreciate, considerable in the way of policing in the sense that there must be constant examination of costs, operating expenditures, etc. The procurement and exploration contracts are much simpler to administer and, as far as the operator is concerned, far more desirable in that there is less red tape for him to go through to secure such a contract.

With respect to your request for a summary on contracts from New Mexico, for your convenience I will break this analysis down by commodities. As of last week, there have been six requests from New Mexico on copper. Three of these have been referred to the field teams for examination. Two are being held for the exploration program which is now in effect and they are being processed. The remaining application has been returned for more information.

Six applications have also been received for lead and zinc—of these, one has been referred to the field team for examination and at the present time is pending their report. The remaining five come under the exploration program and as funds for this program were only made available on April 13, action is just getting under way on them.

With respect to manganese, there are six projects currently before the Defense Minerals Administration. In addition to this, there is the proposed mill and processing plant at El Paso, Tex., and projected sampling and treatment plant at Deming for handling of all shipments from the general New Mexico area. These applications are being checked—one applicant is apparently about to withdraw his application for reasons as yet undetermined. Another applicant sent in what was obviously a promotional item and apparently had no specific project. The United States Geological Survey is currently reviewing an application for a project near Deming.

This analysis covers the major commodity list for applications received from New Mexico; the balance of the 23 fall in other metallic and nonmetallic categories and are currently under investigation.

If at any time you wish to discuss the Defense Minerals Administration program with me personally, please feel at liberty to do so as I am most anxious that our problems be clarified for you and other Members of the United States Senate who are taking a

keen interest in what we are attempting to accomplish. With kindest regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

JAMES BOYD,
Administrator.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the correspondence is examined, Mr. President, it will be found that in answer to my inquiry as to the reasons for delays, I was informed by Dr. James Boyd, the Administrator for the Defense Minerals Administration, that the policy of that agency with respect to loans to miners has had to be brought in conformity with the directives laid down by the Office of Defense Mobilization, of which General Harrison was then listed as Administrator. In substance, that policy was that "the loans provisions of the act were to be used only as a last resort." I point that out because the Congress of the United States, which will be blamed for the delay which has ensued, wrote something quite different into law, and every Senator familiar with the need of the country for minerals tried his very best to make sure that loans could be made available. Not only did they try to make sure about it, but they held hearing after hearing in an endeavor to establish the need for loans. Yet the policy laid down by the Office of Defense Mobilization was "the loan provisions of the act were to be used only as a last resort."

In checking into the placing of these restrictions on the workability of the Defense Act, I found that a very prime mover of this scheme was Mr. Fred Searls, jr., president of the Newmont Mining Corp., acting as chief mineral adviser to the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

This is the same Fred Searls, Jr., who appeared before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on February 13, 1951, and stated that, "any type of subsidy for the development of mining is objectionable." I am very happy that the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is in the Chamber today, because it was the chairman of that committee who somehow sensed that there was something going wrong with this loan program, and summoned Mr. Searls to appear before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and at that hearing, of which there is a complete transcript available, Mr. Searls stated for the record that "any type of subsidy for the development of mining is objectionable."

In answering a question which I propounded to him at that time he stated quite unequivocally that he is and was opposed to the program used by the Government for increasing production of lead, zinc, and copper during World War II.

Although Mr. Searls knew that during that critical period many small mines were denied the necessary priorities with which to work, and that manpower was drained from the mines by the armed services to more attractive defense projects, he would have our committee believe that the contribution of the small mines to the defense and

security of the Nation was trivial if not nonexistent.

Although Mr. Searls' company, the Idarado Mining Co. in Colorado, received a loan from the Metals Reserve Corporation while Mr. H. DeWitt Smith, associated with him in the Newmont Mining Corp. was director of that corporation, he would deny the same privilege to his fellow miners. While admitting that his company had foreign holdings which were receiving Government aid abroad to the extent of \$500,000 through ECA, as in the Société Nord-Africaine du Plomb, a French company, in which the Newmont Mining Co. and the St. Joe Lead Co. have jointly a 49 percent interest, Mr. Searls was taking advantage of his position within the Government to block similar treatment for the independent miners of America. This he admitted on cross examination before the Senate committee on February 13.

Interoffice communications show further Mr. Searls' hostility to the Interior Department's policy.

To show the proper and progressive attitude of the Department of the Interior, and particularly the attitude of Dr. James Boyd, the head of the Bureau of Mines, I desire to insert in the RECORD at this point the letter of February 2, 1951, from the Defense Minerals Administration to Mr. W. H. Harrison, Administrator, Defense Production Administration.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
DEFENSE MINERALS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1951.

Mr. W. H. HARRISON,
Administrator, Defense Production
Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HARRISON: As you undoubtedly know, the Defense Production Act (Public Law 774) has specifically recognized the exploration and development of new mineral sources within the United States must be stimulated and that furthermore, such exploration and development should be done by private industry. The question as to method of accomplishing the desires of Congress has been subject to considerable discussion by the staff of the Defense Minerals Administration and we have discussed this matter with Mr. Fred Searls, of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

For many years prevailing economic conditions have inhibited minerals exploration and it has been difficult for private enterprise to justify and successfully undertake a sufficiently extensive exploration and development program for new minerals to meet the national requirement. Today new ore deposits are increasingly difficult to find; the easily accessible and readily recognizable outcrops that existed throughout our Western States during the last century have largely been investigated. The relationship between exploration costs and the prices of metals and minerals has also influenced this problem in that prices of metals and minerals today seldom cover the cost of replacing mined-out reserves. It must be remembered that in the case of some metals and minerals, many of which are now classed as strategic, prices are largely determined by world markets, whereas costs are determined

by internal economic conditions that frequently influence adversely the incentives for development of new mineral resources.

However, the domestic mining industry feels that certain features exist in the present Federal tax structure which, if changed, might permit a return to companies and individual investors commensurate with the risk involved in exploration ventures. For example, were it possible for the Defense Minerals Administration, or your agency, to persuade the Treasury Department and the appropriate congressional committees to permit any person or corporation to treat as a deduction from net taxable income a loss incurred from an exploration venture that fails to develop a payable mine, even if the person or corporation involved does not dispose of the property under development, increased mineral exploration would follow in natural course. Furthermore, were an operating mining company permitted to treat as an expense chargeable to working cost, money actually devoted to prosecution of an approved strategic mineral development project, it is probable that with some few exceptions no further incentive would be required to stimulate the search for strategic minerals.

Nearly 2 years ago in discussions between the staffs of Interior and other agencies, at a time when several mining subsidy bills were before the Congress, it was pointed out by officials of the Department of the Interior that such tax action would not only achieve the desired result of stimulating search for new minerals but, equally important, the procedure would function automatically—no staff or special agency would be needed to administer Federal loans or grants. All that would be required would be a change in the tax forms. It will be recalled that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recognized the advantage and urgent necessity of such tax action when reporting out S. 2105, the O'Mahoney bill for mine aid, which was subsequently defeated. However, these proposals were not looked upon favorably in 1949 and there appears to be less likelihood of their being approved today. Consequently, the method of exploration aid proposed below is the best means that we have been able to devise so far for attaining our objective.

The current situation undoubtedly warrants prompt action with respect to minerals exploration especially those in critical categories. The cost and drain on transportation, military equipment, and manpower in wartime to maintain foreign supply, and uncertainties of that supply, necessitate as high a degree of self-sufficiency in this strategic group as achievable within reasonable limitations. Furthermore, during the 10 years since the beginning of hostilities in World War II, our reserves have been depleted in the field of critical minerals but the necessary work required to explore for new mineral deposits has not been accomplished and except for the past 2 to 3 years, the skilled manpower needed to carry on this highly specialized type of operation has been inadequate. Finally, the mineral and metal price structure is traditionally unstable.

Therefore, Government assistance for exploration appears to be desirable and we recommend that it be accomplished by making participating grants to bona fide projects (each project would be granted approval only after field investigation by the U. S. Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines) involving search for unknown or undeveloped sources of metals and minerals that have been declared essential by the Defense Minerals Administration.

It is recommended that participation in exploration projects be established on the following terms:

1. The Federal Government to participate in exploration projects on the general principle that the funds contributed by the Government be matched by private capital. This tends to insure that Government funds will not be wasted, and in similar measure tends to limit the presentation of applications for assistance to projects of reasonable merit. Furthermore, it is felt that the principle whereby the applicant furnishes a portion of the capital and thus assumes some risk is sound from the investment point of view. It is recognized that in the case of some of the most strategic metals and minerals the Government may have to depart from the matching principle in whole or in part. In such cases a more thorough examination of the project by the United States Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines would be a prerequisite to a decision by DMA as to the extent of Government participation.

2. The Government should be entitled, whatever the form of arrangement, to some repayment of the amount of its contribution from successful ventures. Therefore, tax-free grants would be made with arrangement for repayment to the Government on a royalty basis from net mill or smelter returns.

3. Applications for exploration grants would be made to DMA. If after review and investigation by DMA the project is approved, it will qualify for the benefits as stated above.

4. Advances would be made quarterly subject to a report of expenditures and progress to be submitted by the operator not later than 15 days after the close of each month. Periodic checks would be made by Government engineers and geologists, and operators would be required to keep adequate records of their projects.

5. In case the applicant is operating under a lease, he would submit a copy of the lease and certification by the owner that the lease is in good standing.

6. The scope and physical extent of the project would be defined by the USGS—Bureau of Mines team for the DMA.

7. Expenditures would cover all direct costs of the project and operating overhead, but no administrative overhead not directly related to the project.

The National Minerals Advisory Council, at its meeting of January 29 in Washington considered the problem of stimulating exploration and recommended a program, in a report to the Secretary of the Interior, very similar to the above. A copy of the council's recommendation is attached.

We are of the opinion that with the exception of some smaller operations a revision of the tax laws as already indicated in this letter would be the simplest, most efficient and effective method of stimulating development and exploration. However, if in your opinion the possibility of such tax revision is remote we strongly recommend the mine-by-mine matched fund program as heretofore outlined. It is estimated that \$10,000,000 will be required to implement this program for the balance of the fiscal year and an appropriation of \$40,000,000 per year thereafter will be required. If you approve the program, we request that you make available \$10,000,000 to the Defense Minerals Administration for the remainder of this fiscal year.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES BOYD,
Administrator.

**NATIONAL MINERALS ADVISORY COUNCIL—
ENCOURAGEMENT OF EXPLORATION**

The Committee on Exploration and Development Incentives submits the following report:

1. The committee continues of the view that income-tax reforms, previously recom-

mended by the council, would contribute more than anything else to the stimulation of exploration. The balance of this report deals with other methods believed to be possible under the Defense Production Act of 1950.

2. It is understood that under that act the Government may make grants or loans to encourage exploration.

3. As a general principle, whenever possible, the funds contributed by the Government should be matched by private capital. That tends to insure that Government funds will not be wasted on frivolous ventures.

4. It is recognized that, in the case of some of the most strategic metals and minerals, the Government may have to depart from the matching principle, in whole or in part. In such cases, a more thorough examination of the project by the USGS or the Bureau of Mines would seem an essential preliminary to Government participation.

5. As a general principle, the Government should be entitled, whatever the form of the arrangement, to repayment of the amount of its contribution from successful ventures. The committee does not feel competent to express an opinion on the income tax questions involved, but suggests consideration of an arrangement for tax-free grants, with payment to the Government of a percentage of profits for a limited period of time.

6. The Government should of course consider questions of availability of manpower, machinery, and equipment in processing applications for exploration assistance.

NOTE.—This resolution of the council represents a proposal to the Secretary of the Interior but is not to be construed as the official policy of the Department.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on February 9, 1951, a similar letter was sent by Mr. Searls to Mr. Harrison opposing the program for the stimulation of mine exploration and development as outlined by the Director of the Defense Minerals Administration. Among other things, he wrote these words:

Our mutual friend, Dr. Boyd, is already under much pressure now from the Hill, and it will be aggravated rather than lessened by initiating any plan which he has so far discussed with me.

I am quoting now from Mr. Searls.

If the National Minerals Advisory Council recommended a plan similar to that set forth in Dr. Boyd's letter, I believe it was a grudging recommendation, based on the idea of necessary surrender to one plan or another.

Mr. President, I pause here to say that I do not think there has been anything in the conduct of either the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs or the House committees or the administration that asked anybody to surrender at any point.

Mr. Searls further stated in this official Government communication, and I quote directly from him:

Should you see fit to use the authority of your Office to oppose mine development subsidies, I will be glad to offer any assistance I can.

He concluded in this fashion—and these words I would be happy to have the senior Senator from Wyoming hear:

There is nothing mandatory in the Defense Production Act or in Executive Order 10161 requiring subsidies. Let us not be driven to them without a fight.

Mr. President, I think it might be well to include at this point the entire text of

the letter from Fred Searls, Jr., to Mr. Harrison, dated February 9, 1951, containing the most interesting proposal which he made to Mr. Harrison at that time. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD in full at this point, together with an enclosure.

There being no objection, the letter and enclosure were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., February 9, 1951.

DEAR MR. HARRISON: Dr. James Boyd has favored me with a copy of his letter of February 7, addressed to you, on the subject of stimulation of mine exploration and development under Public Law 774 (Defense Production Act of 1950).

Since Dr. Boyd has referred in the third paragraph of his letter to a proposal, which I among others have made to him, a copy of it is enclosed herewith. By the means therein suggested, I believe sufficient development work, both in the small-business category and in the way of larger enterprises, could be brought about without any type of Government subsidy.

It is true that the Treasury Department, or at least its Mr. Laszlo Ecker-Racz, has gone on record as opposing the plan which is here advocated. However, I am reliably informed that the American Mining Congress group considering this matter have had assurance, through Mr. Fernald, that certain at least of Senators now holding hearings on the new tax bill would prefer some such plan as I have suggested to any plan of Government subsidies. As you well know, development and production of marginal mines in the last war brought about, not greater metal production, but less metal production.

It is one of your obligations, as I have previously reminded you, to see that the general field of expansion of facilities—and mine development comes in this general category—does not reach such proportions as to add seriously to the accumulating stress on our economy, and there is grave danger that subsidies for mine development will get easily out of hand once the system is started. Subsidized mine development is a particularly difficult type of facility to control because it is not subject to statistical analysis and readily snowballs under political pressure.

Our mutual friend, Dr. Boyd, is already under much pressure now from the Hill, and it will be aggravated rather than lessened by initiating any plan which he has so far discussed with me. If the National Minerals Advisory Council recommended a plan similar to that set forth in Dr. Boyd's letter, I believe it was a grudging recommendation, based on the idea of necessary surrender to one plan or another.

Should you see fit to use the authority of your office to oppose mine development subsidies, I will be glad to offer any assistance I can. Dr. Boyd (cf. first sentence of his last paragraph) apparently agrees that a plan such as is here suggested would be "the simplest, most efficient and effective method of stimulating development and exploration." I believe that also, and I am convinced that the mining industry believes it. There is nothing mandatory in the Defense Production Act or in Executive Order 1061 requiring subsidies. Let us not be driven to them without a fight.

Sincerely yours,

FRED SEARLS, JR.

Sections 301 (a) and 302 of title III of Defense Production Act of 1950 are permissive not mandatory. Could not the duties of the Department of the Interior under section 301 of Executive Order 10161 (Septem-

ber 9, 1950) be carried, if, with other agencies, the Bureau of Mines should persuade the Treasury Department and appropriate congressional taxation committees to enact a provision in the pending tax law that would contain the following provision. (there is, of course, no attempt here to write the legal verbiage or the exact details):

1. Make it possible to treat as a deduction from net taxable income, a loss, by any person or corporation required to pay income taxes, if he shall furnish without prompt success the funds required to carry out a development project either of a virgin mineral occurrence, or of a prospect or partially developed occurrence of a strategic mineral, provided such expenditure fails to actually develop a payable mine; such loss to be taken, even if the person or corporation making the expenditure does not dispose of the property developed, or of such rights pertaining to it as he may have.

2. Permit any operating mining company to treat as an expense chargeable as a working cost, money actually devoted to prosecution of a strategic mineral development project that has been first approved by the Bureau of Mines as a suitable project "for the encouragement of exploration, development and mining of critical and strategic minerals and metals" (sec. 303, Public Law 774, 81st Cong.).

The suggested procedure would require that the Bureau of Mines and/or the United States Geological Survey pass individually, upon any development project submitted as being desirable for development under the purposes of the act. The Bureau of Mines would also have to specify the sum to be expended under the authorized project and the result thereof, i. e., whether successful (immediately exploitable) or unsuccessful in which case the loss may be taken under (1) above or the development "expensed" under (2) above.

It is believed that this procedure, if made permissible by law, would, during the emergency and during the period of high individual and corporate taxes, make available from individuals such as professional men, merchants, contractors, and other people of medium bracket income, as well as from wealthy people and investors, sums of money ranging from \$3,000 or \$4,000 up to \$100,000 for minor developments. Number 2 would permit companies with large metal production now being sold at high prices to devote much larger sums of money to speculative development of owned or neighboring veins, deposits, and partially developed mines, in the general vicinity of their going operations. No Government subsidies would be required for anyone. The accounting would be automatically handled by the parties submitting income-tax returns, and by the Internal Revenue Department which examines such returns. The procedure would die with the emergency, and would automatically lessen in volume if additional supplies permitted some drop in the present cost of metals. There would be considerably less disturbance of the normal present productive mines than if Government subsidy money were made available. The task of the Bureau would be easier since people would, after all, be spending their own money. Essentially, the work would be performed by persons or corporate entities resident in the vicinity of the developments. The amount of bureaucratic procedure compared with any subsidy plan would be materially lessened. There would be much less induced trend toward socialization or nationalization of the mining industry.

The suggested procedure would not preclude handling of large projects involving new plants and other extensive facilities.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, an examination will show that what Mr.

Searls proposes to do is to take the larger mining companies and give them special tax privileges, rather than give to the small miners the opportunity for exploration. We all understand that the large mining companies could very nicely use the special tax provisions which Mr. Searls, as one of the officers of those companies, had suggested. But most people who live in the West know that mines are not discovered that way. Prospectors go forth with a burro and a shovel and a little grub and spend weeks and months in the hills hunting for the particular mineral which they desire, and, therefore, we who have lived in the West and thought we understood the mining business, hoped it might be possible for the Government to extend privileges to the small miners, so they could obtain loans and look for ore in the ordinary fashion.

For the reasons I have stated I have wanted to include in the RECORD at this point all that Mr. Searls wrote to Mr. Harrison, and the memorandum which he submitted.

Mr. Searls' official letter was acknowledged by E. T. Gibson, the Deputy Administrator, on February 14, 1951, in the absence of Mr. Harrison. I desire to commend Mr. Gibson. He is an official of the General Foods Corp. Mining is not his business. But he sensed what was going on in this field, and he replied with commendable courage, in spite of the great influence that Mr. Searls had exercised. He replied very frankly:

We do believe, however, that the importance of obtaining greater metal production is such that the proposal made by Dr. Boyd should be implemented at once and we have initiated action to that end.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the entire letter from Mr. Gibson, dated February 14, 1951.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 14, 1951.

MR. FRED SEARLS, JR.,

Office of the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SEARLS: I am acknowledging your letter of February 9 to Mr. Harrison as he is temporarily away from his office.

As regards the stimulation of mining explorations and development under Public Law 774—Defense Production Act of 1950—we are not only grateful for your comments and offer to be of assistance, but also the many strong points you make in regard to the manner in which stimulation of additional mining productivity may be accomplished. We do believe, however, that the importance of obtaining greater metal production is such that the proposal made by Dr. Boyd should be implemented at once and we have initiated action to that end, rather than depending at this time on possible tax legislation by Congress.

On the other hand, we see nothing inconsistent with approaching this problem simultaneously from your point of view and that of Dr. Boyd.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. GIBSON,
Deputy Administrator.

Mr. ANDERSON. After that Mr. Searls sent a reply, on February 16, 1951, in which he said:

In case whoever wrote the letter was really actuated by belief that artificial stimulation of mining exploration by Government subsidy really increases metal production (which belief I do not think is shared by Bill Harrison), and not by apprehension as to reprisals by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I herewith contribute to the file a memorandum as to the results obtained in the last such a program financed by Government subsidies.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I resent Mr. Searls talking about reprisals by that committee. I have been a member of the committee for only 2½ years, but, so far as I know, it has not been engaged in the practice of conducting reprisals against anyone. If there has been any difficulty, Mr. Searls has brought it on himself, and not the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the covering letter from Mr. Searls, dated February 16, 1951, to Mr. Gibson, and the memorandum which he submitted to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the same date.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., February 16, 1951.
Mr. E. T. GIBSON,
Deputy Administrator, Defense Production Administration, Commerce Department Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GIBSON: Thank you for your letter of February 14 replying to mine of February 9 addressed to Mr. Harrison.

In case whoever wrote the letter was really actuated by belief that artificial stimulation of mining exploration by Government subsidy really increases metal production (which belief I do not think is shared by Bill Harrison), and not by apprehension as to reprisals by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I herewith contribute to the file a memorandum as to the results obtained in the last such a program financed by Government subsidies.

This memorandum is furnished to the above-named committee at its request and is enclosed to you gratuitously. Thank you very much.

Very truly yours,

FRED SEARLS, Jr.

FEBRUARY 16, 1951.

Memorandum to Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The following is the statement requested of me in testimony before your committee on February 13. It is largely taken from a report to Mr. Hill of the National Security Resources Board in 1943, which report, though classified, was made available to the Congress.

FRED SEARLS, Jr.

"It was demonstrated during the last war, and in a period since the war, that the premium-price plan did not and does not increase production of nonferrous metals during periods of full employment. The fundamental underlying reason is that production of metal per man-shift in marginal mines is substantially less than in producing higher-grade mines; and the diversion of labor to mines requiring Government aid for profitable operation means a greater decrease in output from the good mines, than is compensated by the marginal pro-

duction. This principle, clearly recognized, supported, and even implemented by the armed services during the activities of the WPB Facilities Bureau in 1942 and 1943, was redemonstrated in 1946 under the premium-price plan. It is interesting to note that the Munitions Board, mindful of wartime experience, has firmly and consistently declined—against congressional advice—to tie stockpiling plans to any mineral subsidy program.

"The decrease in output of copper, lead, and zinc is shown in the attached table I. This shows a gradual deterioration of production from 1942 through 1946, during the existence of the premium-price plan. The copper decreased from 988,000-ton level in 1942 to a low of 602,000 tons in 1946. For lead the corresponding figures are 447,000 tons in 1942 reduced to a low of 332,000 tons in 1946, and the zinc reduced from the level of 696,000 tons in 1942 to 565,000 tons in 1946.

"Available statistical data on manpower productivity (metal produced per man-shift employed in the industry) in copper, lead, and zinc mines do not clearly show the effect of shifting available manpower from the more efficient to the less efficient mines that were paid premiums. This is because the breakdown is not available of the more efficient against the less efficient production during the war years. In the case of copper for example (see table II), the actual fact is that productivity in terms of metal per man-shift increased for the period 1942 to 1946 for open-pit mines, which were with only one exception not paid any premiums. At the same time the productivity of the underground mines, which encompassed the great majority of the mines to which premiums were paid, decreased sharply, reflecting unproductive diversion of labor to the less efficient mines. Because the larger part of the Nation's production was derived from the open-cut mines during the period in question, the rising trend of efficiency in these nonpremium mines masked the falling productivity of underground mines, and the over-all result as shown by the United States Bureau of Mines manpower figures for copper indicates a general upward trend.

"The same general conclusions and breakdown on the productivity in lead and zinc mines would hold.

"A case in point, showing the ill-advised diversion of labor to unproductive purposes, is the Leadville Tunnel, which the chairman mistakenly thought was in some way desired by Resurrection Mining Co., a subsidiary of Newmont, on the grounds that it would be of assistance to Newmont activities in Lead-

ville. On the contrary, the tunnel has been and will be of no assistance to Newmont, and has been opposed by Newmont as a wasteful expenditure. It is a typical Government project, which was operated during the closing years of the last war with the diversion of about 180 men from production effort in the Resurrection Mine and the Climax Molybdenum Mine, and was then abandoned during the entire interemergency period, being started up again last year with the diversion of 60 or 70 of the best miners in Leadville from producing lead and zinc in Resurrection Mine, and molybdenum in the Climax Molybdenum Mine.

"The present shortage of molybdenum is particularly grave, and a telegram, quoted below, from Mr. Harnischfeger, head of the Harnischfeger Corp., states it is urgently needed for steam shovels, heavy cranes, and similar heavy equipment. This equipment is being delayed, as is stated in his telegram, by the shortage of molybdenum.

"The cost of the Leadville Tunnel during the first period of operation was approximately \$186 a foot, about four times the normal cost of such a tunnel driven as a private enterprise. The present cost is not known, but is greater than is justified by any likelihood of production within the next 2 years. It is my opinion that little or no ore will ever be taken out via the Government tunnel."

[Copy of telegram]

FEBRUARY 5, 1951.

Mr. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C.:

Recent molybdenum delivery order will completely prohibit production and shipment of 75 to 80 percent of power cranes and shovels, hoists, overhead cranes, engines, and welding electrodes. Will cause loss of \$3,000,000 monthly shipments and unemployment of at least 1,800 persons.

Molybdenum is used in all our alloy irons and alloy rolled and cast-products. Our engineering department was asked to find substitutes during the previous war. All substitutes now possible lead into other previously restricted and critically short alloying elements. It is inconceivable that our Government is setting up crippling restrictions for essential products which necessarily are highly stressed and require alloys.

We request immediate review of this stringent order.

HARNISCHFEGER CORP.,
W. HARNISCHFEGER, President.

TABLE I.—Premium and total production of copper, lead, and zinc in tons during premium-price plan

	Copper		Lead		Zinc	
	Premium metal	Total metal	Premium metal	Total metal	Premium metal	Total metal
1942.....	100,358	988,064	77,798	447,056	199,590	696,243
1943.....	231,385	1,090,818	147,941	444,000	395,153	740,668
1944.....	220,651	969,789	205,568	410,016	432,337	715,806
1945.....	202,257	771,863	239,192	356,561	393,583	612,548
1946.....	203,689	602,355	225,662	332,478	378,140	565,787

TABLE II.—Productivity in copper mines

	Open cut		Block caving		Other underground		All mines	
	Total pounds of copper	Production, pounds Cu/M da.	Total pounds of copper	Production, pounds Cu/M da.	Total pounds of copper	Production, pounds Cu/M da.	Total pounds of copper	Pounds Cu/M da.
1943.....	1,182,000,000	652	302,000,000	328	500,000,000	103	1,984,000,000	262
1946.....	720,000,000	700	164,000,000	348	192,000,000	92	1,076,000,000	300

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, an interesting thing about this memorandum is that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs does not seem to have a copy of it. I called the clerk of the committee this morning, and ascertained that she does not have a copy of it. A most efficient young lady is the clerk of that committee, and I assume that she would have a copy of it had it arrived. But it is an interesting document, because in order to prove that subsidies do not work, he quoted the experience of the year 1946. That year was under the premium price plan, to be sure, but it was a year when the war was over, as Mr. Searls well knew, and people in the mining industry feared that once the war was over prices might drop. Therefore, I suggest to the President and to Members of the Senate that when they read this interesting document sent to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and not yet received by the committee, they bear in mind that some of the material used as a comparison, namely, the year 1946, is obviously not proper, because 1946 was not a year in which production should have been increased, but a year in which everyone would have expected that production would drop off.

It is not my purpose to charge Mr. Searls with improper conduct as Mineral Adviser to the Director of the Defense program, but it is quite clear from the record of Mr. Searls' activities that he is diametrically opposed to the program urged by the President of the United States and adopted by the Congress, as set forth in Public Law 774.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks those sections of that public law, the Defense Production Act of 1950, which are the amendments sponsored by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] for the exploration, development, and mining of critical and strategic minerals and metals. I refer to section 302, 303, and 304.

There being no objection, the sections referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTIONS 302, 303, AND 304 OF THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

(These sections contain the amendments sponsored by Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY for the exploration, development, and mining of critical and strategic minerals and metals.)

SEC. 302. To expedite production and deliveries or services to aid in carrying out Government contracts for the procurement of materials or the performance of services for the national defense, the President may make provision for loans (including participations in, or guarantees of, loans) to private business enterprises (including research corporations not organized for profit) for the expansion of capacity, the development of technological processes, or the production of essential materials, including the exploration, development, and mining of strategic and critical metals and minerals. Such loans may be made without regard to the limitations of existing law and on such terms and conditions as the President deems necessary, except that financial assistance may be extended only to the extent that it is not otherwise available on reasonable terms.

SEC. 303. (a) To assist in carrying out the objectives of this act, the President may make provision (1) for purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other raw materials, including liquid fuels for Government use or for resale; and (2) for the encouragement of exploration, development, and mining of critical and strategic minerals and metals: *Provided, however,* That purchases for resale under this subsection shall not include agricultural commodities except insofar as such commodities may be purchased for resale for industrial uses or stockpiling, and no agricultural commodity shall be sold for such purposes at less than the higher of the following: (i) The current market price for such commodity, or (ii) the minimum sale price established for agricultural commodities owned or controlled by the Commodity Credit Corporation as provided in section 407 of Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress.

(b) Subject to the limitations in subsection (a), purchases and commitments to purchase and sales under such subsection may be made without regard to the limitations of existing law, for such quantities, and on such terms and conditions, including advance payments, and for such periods, as the President deems necessary, except that purchases or commitments to purchase involving higher than currently prevailing market prices or anticipated loss on resale shall not be made unless it is determined that supply of the materials could not be effectively increased at lower prices or on terms more favorable to the Government, or that such purchases are necessary to assure the availability to the United States of overseas supplies.

(c) The procurement power granted to the President by this section shall include the power to transport and store, and have processed and refined, any materials procured under this section.

(d) When in his judgment it will aid the national defense, the President is authorized to install additional equipment, facilities, processes, or improvements to plants, factories, and other industrial facilities owned by the United States Government, and to install Government-owned equipment in plants, factories, and other industrial facilities owned by private persons.

SEC. 304. (a) For the purposes of sections 302 and 303, the President is hereby authorized to utilize such existing departments, agencies, officials, or corporations of the Government as he may deem appropriate, or to create new agencies (other than corporations).

(b) Any agency created under this section, and any department, agency, official, or corporation utilized pursuant to this section is authorized, subject to the approval of the President, to borrow from the Treasury of the United States, such sums of money as may be necessary to carry out its functions under sections 302 and 303: *Provided,* That the total amount borrowed under the provisions of this section by all such borrowers shall not exceed an aggregate of \$600,000,000 outstanding at any one time. For the purpose of borrowing as authorized by this subsection, the borrower may issue to the Secretary of the Treasury its notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations to be redeemable at its option before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in such obligations. Such obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase such obligations and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any

securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of obligations hereunder.

(c) In addition to the sums authorized to be borrowed under subsection (b), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of sections 302 and 303, such sums, not in excess of \$1,400,000,000 as may be necessary therefor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Under section 302 of that act it is specifically provided that—

To expedite production and deliveries or services to aid in carrying out Government contracts for the procurement of materials or the performance of services for the national defense, the President may make provision for loans (including participations in, or guarantees, of loans) to private business enterprises (including research corporations not organized for profit) for the expansion of capacity, the development of technological processes, or the production of essential materials, including the exploration, development, and mining of strategic and critical metals and minerals. Such loans may be made without regard to the limitations of existing law and on such terms and conditions as the President deems necessary, except that financial assistance may be extended only to the extent that it is not otherwise available on reasonable terms.

That is the law, Mr. President; but men like Mr. Searls take it upon themselves to advise official agencies of the Government to disregard the exact provisions of the law and prevent its proper functioning, as expressly desired by the Congress of the United States.

I call attention at this point to the fact that that provision, so wisely written into the law by the senior Senator from Wyoming, specifically points out that loans are to be made. It points out how such loans are to be made. And yet, months after the enactment of the legislation—in fact, up until today—only one loan has been made, out of more than 700 applications. The reason why only one loan has been made is that the Department of the Interior has been handcuffed by a directive which was inspired by Mr. Searls, who does not desire to see domestic production of minerals.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I was not in the Chamber when the Senator started his speech. Who is Mr. Searls, and what is his background?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Searls was brought here as an adviser to the Office of Defense Production. He is the head of the Newmont Mining Corp., which has mines in Africa and many other parts of the world. In that position he advised General Harrison not to establish a policy of making loans except as a last resort.

Mr. AIKEN. In what kinds of minerals is he interested?

Mr. ANDERSON. Lead, zinc, and copper. He is interested in all those metals abroad. The foreign price of zinc, for example, is 27½ cents. The domestic price is 17½ cents. Naturally, when we are compelling some agencies of the Government to buy lead and zinc from organizations abroad at 27½ cents, and will not let our own miners have

more than 17½ cents, our miners cannot understand it.

Mr. AIKEN. We are also putting a price of 23 cents on foreign copper, and a ceiling of 24 cents on domestically produced copper.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. The Senator from Vermont understands the situation.

The point is that we do not understand why, under such circumstances, a man was brought in to advise the Office of Defense Production, and did advise them, not to permit or encourage the domestic production of these materials, in order that foreign materials might be imported. Had it not been that the Senator from Wyoming called Mr. Searls before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and exposed his complete opposition to the program which Congress had written into the law, he might still be in that position.

Mr. AIKEN. Has he gone now?

Mr. ANDERSON. Thanks to the Senator from Wyoming, he has departed.

Mr. AIKEN. I was about to say that it would be possible for me to understand how he could be appointed to the position he occupied, because mistakes are sometimes made; but it would be impossible for me to understand why he should be retained in it.

Mr. ANDERSON. There was no mistake made in appointing Mr. Searls in the first place. Those who were associated with the philosophy of Mr. Searls during the last war could not help but recognize, as the Senator from Wyoming and others recognized, as soon as he was brought into the picture, that he was there to prevent the expansion of domestic mining and to encourage the development of mining abroad. If the Senator from Wyoming wished to do so at some point in this discussion he could point out that when he and others had passed a very fine bill for the expansion of the domestic metals industry, Senate bill 2108, as I remember, it was lobbied to death in the House by Mr. Snyder, who is vice president of the Newmont Metals Co., with the assistance of Mr. Searls. These people are absolutely opposed to the development of domestic mining.

Before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs there was testimony by the Calumet & Hecla Corp. I used that corporation as an example, because it is not a western mining company, but a company in the State of Michigan. There was testimony by that company that if something were not done to raise the domestic price of copper they would have to close their valuable mines in Michigan and allow them to become filled with water, and that they could not subsequently pump out the water economically. Therefore those mines would be lost to the domestic production of copper. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that is exactly what happened. The Calumet and Hecla copper mines closed. It has not been economically feasible to reopen them. It is all because we were persuaded at the time to engage in a policy which destroyed local mines. Mr.

Searls and his company were the prime architects of that policy.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say that the same condition would undoubtedly prevail with regard to copper mines in Vermont, except that our mines are so located that probably they would not be filled with water. However, it is entirely possible that the production of copper in the mines which are located in Vermont, whose annual production is only about 8,000,000 pounds a year, could be doubled or trebled if the mine owners were permitted to get the same price for their copper that our Government wishes us to pay for foreign copper.

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe the Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. With the 4-cents-a-pound differential they could do a great deal of exploratory work. We have no idea how much copper is available in Vermont. We know there is a great deal more in the ground than has been uncovered so far. The same is true of asbestos and other materials. I wonder if since Mr. Searls' departure from his post of vantage there has been any change in policy of the Department for the better?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe it is fair to say that the Department of the Interior did not need a change of heart. It has been trying steadily to develop the minerals of the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. I did not mean that.

Mr. ANDERSON. It did all it could possibly do to make possible the domestic production of minerals.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder whether the domestic-production program has improved, or whether the Department has merely let out one man and brought another man like him into the Department.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would say it has been improved slightly.

Mr. AIKEN. Do I understand that the Senator's speech is directed toward making a still further improvement in that regard?

Mr. ANDERSON. I want to make sure of two things. First of all I wish to make sure that Congress does not get blamed for the failure to develop domestic mines, because the Congress of the United States provided a satisfactory blueprint, permitting the development. Secondly, I do not wish to have the Department of Interior get the blame, because I have tried to put into the Record letters from Dr. James Boyd, indicating that he was trying to do his very best to make the program work, but that he had been handcuffed by a directive issued by the Office of Defense Mobilization. That directive has never been changed. In simple words it says: "Make loans only as a last resort." Congress had said: "Make loans whenever you get ready to make them."

Mr. AIKEN. We seem to have a new style of Government coming in with the so-called emergency agencies.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am trying to make the words of Congress become effective. I am glad that the Senator from Vermont feels as I do.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope the Senator from New Mexico succeeds in his efforts.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was glad to hear the question raised by the Senator from Vermont, because when in the last Congress the Senate was considering Senate bill 2108, reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs the Senator from Vermont was very effective in his support of it. It passed the Senate. However, as the Senator from New Mexico has stated, it did not move out of the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives. According to the information which came to me, the obstacle in its path was precisely the sort of operation which the Senator from New Mexico is now describing.

In view of the fact that the Senator has attributed to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs the departure of Mr. Searls from the position of advantage which he held in the Defense Mobilization organization, and in view of the letter which the Senator from New Mexico has inserted in the Record from Mr. Searls, implying that reprisals from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs might affect some of those gentlemen, I wish the Record to be quite clear that I took no hostile move, by way of reprisal or otherwise, against Mr. Searls, except to reveal in the hearings, which fact is now recorded, the contrary views which Mr. Searls had taken with respect to the development of minerals in the United States as compared with the development of minerals in other countries, in which the Newmont Mining Co., a holding company, has a vital interest.

The Senator from New Mexico attended the hearings. He will recall that I read from an issue of Fortune magazine the dramatic story of how the Government of South Africa, by government subvention, subsidy, and tax concession had enabled the Newmont Mining Co. to turn a mineral venture which was losing money into a very profitable venture. The beneficiary of that activity by government was the same Newmont Mining Co. The Senator will remember that I also placed in the Record the fact, which cannot be gainsaid, that a zinc and lead company in North Africa, partly owned by French capital and partly owned by the same Newmont Mining Co., was a beneficiary of ECA loans. Therefore there was no objection on the part of these gentlemen to the granting of government aid by a foreign government to mines within the jurisdiction of a foreign government, namely, South Africa, nor any objection on their part to the reception by a company, in which the Newmont Mining Co. was interested, of Government aid flowing from the Treasury of the United States, by way of ECA, into the coffers of the company which Mr. Searls represented.

I am very happy indeed that the Senator from New Mexico has undertaken on the floor of the Senate, to spread the facts in the Record, so that all who are interested in the development of the economic strength of the United States and the people of the United States may

know how international organizations sometimes hold their hand on the throttle of progress in the United States by preventing development.

I also want the record to be quite clear that no action was taken by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs or its chairman with respect to Mr. Searls except to develop these facts at a committee hearing.

Ever since World War I an effort has been made to stimulate the development of the mineral resources of the United States within our boundaries. Ever since World War I there have been obstacles, sometimes hidden, sometimes open, placed in the path of development of our mineral resources.

In 1946 I had charge on the floor of the Senate of a bill to amend the act of June 7, 1939, which was the original stockpiling act. The bill was passed by the Senate and by the House, and it was approved by the President on July 23, 1946. The purpose of the bill was to stimulate the development of strategic and critical materials. Mr. Bernard Baruch, who, as everyone knows, was the head of the War Production Board in World War I, at the close of the hearing pointed out the great need of making the United States independent of foreign sources of supply, by building up adequate stockpiles. His advice was not taken.

When the bill was passed, his advice was not taken, and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] will be interested to know that about 2 years ago, while the Committee on Appropriations was considering an item for the purchase throughout the world of strategic and critical materials, the same Mr. Franz Snyder, the vice president of the Newmont Mining Co., appeared before the committee in opposition to the appropriations which had been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

If those appropriations had then been made and if those purchases had then been made, the United States would not be in the position of shortage in which it is now, just as if the House of Representatives had passed Senate bill 2108 a year ago, we would have been far along the road of adequate preparedness in the gathering of the necessary supplies of critical and strategic materials.

I am very happy, indeed, that the Senator from New Mexico has undertaken to tell this story where it may be well known to the public.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Wyoming has said. Again I wish to say that the article in *Fortune* magazine, to which the Senator has referred, was available to all the Members of the United States Senate. It was called to the attention of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It showed that this company, which has a Government loan and which considers such loans bad for other mining companies in the United States, was perfectly willing to accept the Government's assistance in its efforts in South Africa. Furthermore, it was pointed out, as the Senator from Wyoming has suggested again, that ECA grants had been made in large quanti-

ties to this very company, to put it into shape so that it might sell ores to this country, but at the same time the man who obtained those grants was testifying that the Government should never assist a domestic mining company.

The law to which we have been referring, further provides, in section 303, that—

The President may make provision for purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other raw materials—and for the encouragement of exploration, development, and mining of critical and strategic minerals and metals.

It is further provided under that section that purchases and commitments to purchase may be made without regard to the limitations of existing law, in such quantities and on such terms and conditions, including advance payments, and for such periods as the President deems necessary, except the purchases or commitments to purchase involving higher than currently prevailing market prices shall not be made unless it is determined that supply of the materials could not be effectively increased at lower prices or on terms more favorable to the Government or that such purchases are necessary to assure the availability to the United States of overseas supplies.

The President is given the right further under this section to transport and store materials purchased or to have them processed and refined. He may install additional equipment, facilities, or improvements to carry out the program. He is authorized to use existing departments, agencies, and officials to carry out the intent of Congress.

Further, under section 304 (b) of the act, any agency created under this section is authorized, subject to the approval of the President, to borrow from the Treasury of the United States such sums of money as may be necessary to carry out the functions as provided under the two sections to which I have just referred. Specifically, to carry out the minerals program, \$5,000,000 was set aside, and an additional \$5,000,000 would probably have been made available by the President's authorization, had the agencies charged with the responsibility of carrying out the act properly functioned and committed or expended the earmarked amounts. Much of this money has not been used and had to be returned during the fiscal year just closed, although additional amounts are being sought for the coming year. In fact, the President, in his recent message to the Congress, has asked for an additional \$800,000,000 to stockpile strategic and critical raw materials needed for national defense.

As the Senator from Wyoming has just pointed out, when an item of that nature was before the Appropriations Committee some time ago, Vice President Franz Snyder, of the Newmont Mining Co., appeared and opposed such an appropriation. That occurred during the last Congress. Had we made these stockpile appropriations and purchases then, we would have saved millions upon millions of dollars.

In contrast to the position taken by Mr. Searls in advocating policies which are contrary to the mandate of Congress, the Secretary of the Interior, in his appearance before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, stated on February 12, 1951, that—

Five months have elapsed since the delegation by the President of responsibilities under the Defense Production Act of 1950.

Under this act it was necessary to set up an efficient organization and select high-caliber personnel and carefully spell out programs. His function was to recommend to the Defense Production Administrator actions with respect to and for the exploration and development of important minerals, applications for tax amortization certificates, and loans and purchase contracts. He said he was charged with the responsibility of making final certification to the financial and contracting agencies on these matters. He stated that the Administrator of the Defense Minerals Administration had developed in short order a working personnel from a nucleus in the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines; that the Interior agencies were the basic points of contact between the Government and the industries which they represent.

In analyzing procedure, the Secretary explained that applications for assistance in exploration and development of minerals, for loans for expansion of facilities, for tax amortization certificates, and for purchase contracts, are all submitted to Interior Department agencies before they are sent to the Defense Production Administrator for final action.

The Secretary emphasized that the task was twofold when he said:

We must increase our production quickly enough to meet the immediate needs of our rearmament program with minimum cutbacks in civilian supplies and (2) we must expand our productive capacity to assure that we have an economic base sufficient to support an all-out effort.

He further stated that industries with which his agency was in communication were anxious to carry out the program, and that his agency had received 300 applications for accelerated tax amortization, amounting to \$1,600,000,000; that the Interior agencies had sent to DPA and its predecessor agency, NSRB, recommendations on 40 applications, involving \$200,000,000.

The Secretary further pointed out that Public Law 520, section 7, authorized and directed the Secretary of the Interior, through the Director of the Bureau of Mines and the Director of the Geological Survey, "to make scientific, technological, and economic investigations concerning the extent and mode of occurrence, the development, mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and other mineral substances found in the United States or its territories or insular possessions, which are essential to the common defense or the industrial needs of the United States."

It was explained that the Geological Survey has been engaged in determining the extent and mode of occurrence of mineral deposits, and that the Bureau of Mines has projects under way for the

utilization of existing ores and minerals. Mentioning projects for the development of minerals within the United States, the Secretary referred to the San Manuel copper deposits in Arizona. The large copper deposit there is under contract negotiation now, and is expected to be brought into production in the next few years. It is interesting here to note that in testimony before the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, Dr. Boyd showed that the San Manuel copper deposits were discovered by Government agencies, and that their extent and commercial applicability were determined by governmental agencies.

In this connection, Mr. President, I point out that the testimony to which I now refer appears in the House hearings at page 174, on the third supplemental appropriation bill for defense agencies, 1951.

This property is now under ownership of Magma Copper Co., a subsidiary of the Newmont Mining Corp., of which Mr. Fred Searls, Jr., is president. The Government not only discovered this deposit, but is helping finance its operation. It would seem that Mr. Searls again did not object to the use of Government funds for the discovery, development, and financing of the San Manuel copper-mining operations, nor did Mr. Searls object to having a long-term contract entered into between a subsidiary corporation of his and the United States Government in amounts involving many millions of dollars. But he objects to similar help for others.

In testimony before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee Mr. Searls pointed with pride to his opposition to the Leadville drainage tunnel in Colorado, but carefully made no mention of the Government loan which another one of his subsidiary companies had obtained for the driving of the Idarado tunnel at Ouray, Colo. Here it should be clearly explained that in the case of the Leadville drainage tunnel, to which Mr. Searls specifically objected, innumerable small mine owners, as well as larger mining companies, would be benefited, while in the case of the Idarado tunnel, to which Mr. Searls raised no objection, the properties benefited belonged entirely to the one company under his direction and supervision.

In examining further the activities of Mr. Searls one observes in the inter-office communications references made to a report on the mineral deposits of the United States in the possession of the National Security Resources Board. Mr. Searls points to this report with pride, and quotes it as an authority on the subject. Mr. Searls does not mention, however, that he and his business associate, Mr. H. DeWitt Smith, of the Newmont Mining Corp., are its authors and that they were paid for its compilation with Government funds.

Mr. President, I bring these matters to the attention of the Senate because I believe that the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Director of the Defense Minerals Administration are anxious to see the mandates of Congress carried out to the fullest extent, and to have loans and grants

which will encourage and stimulate production of minerals made to those who are engaged in the mining industry. It is apparent from the record that these executives of our Government are anxious to see exploration and development work done and contracts entered into so that the safety and security of our country can be made possible through increased production of minerals within our borders. Criticism coming from the mining districts is justified, however, because the program is not working and has not worked. In my opinion the responsibility of these delays should be largely placed upon the obstructionist policies of one Fred Searls, Jr.

Mr. President, I hope that with the elimination of Mr. Fred Searls, Jr. from Government service, this program will be speeded up, and that those in charge of it will see that the mining industry and those engaged in the production of minerals are promptly given the benefit of the provisions of the existing law.

COMMITTEE TRIP TO EUROPE AND BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as I said earlier today in obtaining leave of absence, on Saturday, July 7, several members of the Foreign Relations Committee, including myself, will leave by a military air transport plane for a brief official visit to Europe.

Our principal purpose will be to gather first-hand information in London, Paris, Athens, Rome, Madrid, Ankara, and Munich, regarding the current and foreseeable European situation. We will want, for example, to explore the extent of Europe's economic recovery, her military contribution to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, her morale, and her spirit of cooperation with the United States.

It is indeed our hope that the presence right on the scene of various members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will in itself be a source of encouragement to the European peoples—a symbol of the friendship of the United States, of our desire to understand at first hand Europe's problems, coupled with our desire to improve our working relationship insofar as possible.

TRIP IS NOT A JUNKET

I want to make it quite clear, Mr. President, that this is a trip on official business of the United States Government. It is not what has been sometimes called a junket. We go to work, and to work hard. The expenses will be borne largely out of ECA counter-part funds, and so there will be a minimum, relatively speaking, of direct cost to the United States Government. In other words, the governments over there will be largely paying for it.

OUR CONCLUSIONS WILL SHAPE REVIEW OF PACKAGE AID

I want to point out, further, that following our return, we of the committee will launch into a consideration of the \$8,500,000,000 economic and military aid package. And so the conclusions which we gather from this trip can be of tremendous importance in our future review of the way in which the funds of

the American people have been spent, are being spent, and may be spent.

Within a period of 2 weeks we hope to crowd into every available moment of the day frank, deailed talks with General Eisenhower, with top United States and foreign diplomats, military, economic, and other officials. We trust that this trip may be a contribution to the unity of those powers which are dedicated to freedom, mutual self-help, and peace.

TRIP SHOULD AID BIPARTISAN POLICY

Both Republicans and Democrats will, of course, be on the trip, but they will go as Americans, as Senators of the United States, anxious to contribute to the future peace and prosperity of the world.

We trust further, that this trip will be an aid to bipartisan foreign policy. And while I am on this subject I should like to say a few additional words on this same theme and to place in the Record an exchange of correspondence which I have recently had with the Secretary of State.

LIP SERVICE NOT ENOUGH OF BIPARTISAN POLICY

We are all aware that bipartisan or, preferably nonpartisan foreign policy has had a rocky time in recent months and years. A lot of folks pay lip service to it, and little more.

As one Senator, however, and as ranking Republican member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I have tried various devices to help further genuine unity between the two major parties in foreign affairs.

MY PROPOSAL FOR CONSULTATION WITH AMBASSADORS

On April 17, on the floor of the Senate, I suggested that one of the means by which there could be closer cooperation (a) between the executive and legislative branches, and (b) between the Democratic and Republican Parties, would be to have members of the Senate Foreign Relations and other committees consult with those United States Ambassadors, Chiefs of ECA missions, and other high United States officials who might be visiting this country temporarily from their foreign assignments.

I had corresponded on this same matter in the early part of April with Secretary of State Acheson. In June, I again corresponded along this line with the State Department through Assistant Secretary of State Jack McFall. I sent a copy of that message to Hon. William C. Foster, Administrator for the Economic Cooperation Administration, who, incidentally, is a good Republican but who has been doing a very crucial job in a very nonpartisan way.

ECA CHIEF'S COMMENTS

Under date of June 26, Mr. Foster kindly replied:

We shall always try to be sure that the committee is kept advised whenever any Chief of Mission or other key official is expected to return to Washington. Arrangements may then be made for consultation with members either formally or informally, should it be desired.

I am glad to say that this matter of executive-legislative consultation has indeed been going ahead in actual practice.

MY TALKS WITH ECA OFFICIALS

In the recent past, for example, it was my pleasure to get together with Mr. Paul Porter, Assistant Administrator for program of the ECA. Mr. Porter, who now makes his home in Kenosha, Wis., had performed most excellently for our country in Greece. He gave me a report on ECA work throughout the world, with particular reference to the Far East. Some time before that I had also enjoyed a chat with Mr. Foster in my office.

In recent weeks, too, there have been consultations, either formally or informally, with United States High Commissioner to Germany John McCloy; with Ambassador Loy Henderson, our Chief of Mission at India; with Hon. Myron Cowen, our able United States Ambassador at Manila; and with other high United States officials.

PHILIPPINE STORY A REAL "COME-BACK EPIC"

With regard to Ambassador Cowen, I am glad to report that at my invitation several members of the Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and myself had a very splendid luncheon conversation. Ambassador Cowen gave us a terse report on the splendid progress which has been made in the Philippines. The fact-packed story he told described, in my judgment, one of the great come-back epics of the postwar era. Here we have a country, the Philippines, which was horribly devastated by World War II, a country which found its finances in a very difficult condition, a country which faced armed insurrection forces reliably reported to be aided by Moscow and certainly to be staffed by Red leadership. Yet here was a country whose deep comradeship with the United States, whose personal courage in war and peace are known throughout the world. Given those ingredients—a challenge plus the stamina to meet the challenge—and given able cooperation by our State Department officials, on the basis of genuine friendship, mutual understanding, and respect, progress was assured.

STATISTICS ON PHILIPPINE PROGRESS

I have in my hands a statistical story of that progress as it was conveyed to the President of the United States by Ambassador Cowen on his visit to the White House and as it was submitted to us on request of members of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I also have in my hand the letter which I wrote to the Secretary of State following our get-together with Ambassador Cowen. While ordinarily I would consider this matter as purely for private consideration, I do believe that the facts of cooperation cited in it will be of interest to my colleagues, and so I should like to make it a matter of public record at this point.

We all recognize that frequently headlines are made by evidences of disunity. While headlines will not be made by this particular demonstration of sincere unity, I think that the lessons which we have learned from it, the mutual faith

which has been developed by it, will be far more important in time to come than will instances of dissension which have been far more widely reported in the press.

And so, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point (a) the text of my exchange with Secretary of State Dean Acheson, including my letter of June 23 and his reply of July 3 and (b) the statistical story of progress in the Philippines submitted to me by Ambassador Cowen.

There being no objection, the letters and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
June 23, 1951.

Re our consultation with visiting ambassador.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to you to report on a very fine luncheon session which several Senators and I had yesterday afternoon with one of the President's very able Ambassadors, the Honorable Myron Cowen. I had learned that he was to shortly return to Manila, and I felt that my colleagues and I on the Foreign Relations Committee would enjoy and profit from seeing him and getting the benefit of his fine judgment.

And so I arranged for a luncheon session at which Ambassador Cowen related to Senators SPARKMAN, GREEN, HUMPHREY, and myself the story of the outstanding economic progress which has been achieved in the Philippines. The Ambassador also met later on just for a moment or two, with Senators CONNALLY, KERR, and KEFAUVER.

In the course of our conversation at the table, he happened to mention the considerable problem which the Kem amendment is causing our diplomatic relations with southeast Asiatic lands. What he had to say made a very deep and favorable impression on us, and it supplemented what John J. McCloy had told us on this very same issue.

All of the Senators at the table agreed that the sort of straight-from-the-shoulder presentation which Ambassador Cowen extemporaneously made is "just what the doctor ordered," insofar as helping us Members of the Senate to gain a better understanding of the actual, individual problems that are being experienced in the field by our highest diplomatic representatives.

In response to one of the Ambassador's comments, Senator HUMPHREY soundly suggested—and the rest of us concurred—that what ought to be done is to have more luncheon sessions of the same sort at which the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the ranking majority and minority members and similar members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, together with the leading sponsors and backers of the Kem amendment, could get together and hear at first hand further evidences of the type of problem you folks are running into abroad. I am convinced that such a presentation would be a tremendous contribution to bipartisan understanding on the Kem amendment or for that matter, on virtually any other issue.

I also want to take this occasion to say that I appreciate the splendid and prompt cooperation of the Department in helping to arrange for this visit with me by the Am-

bassador prior to his departure today. My colleagues and I wish him well and look forward to his further service to the Nation.

I am delighted to note, too, that in line with my previous letter suggestion, there is now being made available to the Foreign Relations Committee on a weekly basis, a listing of the top United States diplomatic officials visiting Washington, so that we of the Foreign Relations Committee and our colleagues of the Appropriations Committee might be able to consult at first hand with these top-level people.

Finally, may I mention that this afternoon, there will be broadcast over station WGN, Chicago, an address which I had prepared by transcription, mentioning this procedure of ambassadorial consultation (illustrated by this Philippine chat) as one of the techniques of strengthening bipartisan foreign policy. I will insert my address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday, and I do hope that, amidst your busy day you and your associates might have the opportunity to glance through it, particularly because I think that you will generally agree with most of the suggestions made in it.

One of the things that I stated in the address was that I feel it is incumbent on Members of the Senate to give praise unhesitatingly where they feel it is justly deserved by members of your Department, or for that matter, any other governmental agency, and I thought that I might follow that precept by this letter to you today.

With kindest wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY,

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, July 3, 1951.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you very much for your letter of June 23. It was thoughtful of you to send your words of praise—and good to receive them. I have passed them on to Jack McFall and others who are working with me in our effort to improve the understanding and working relations between Congress and the Executive branch on problems in the conduct of our foreign relations.

It was a pleasure to arrange for Ambassador Cowen to attend your luncheon meeting. I am confident that the discussion was as profitable to him in carrying out his heavy responsibilities as you indicated it was to you and your colleagues.

We feel that Senator HUMPHREY's suggestion which you have endorsed for more luncheon meetings of this kind to be attended by our representatives home from abroad would indeed be helpful in obtaining a better understanding of our common problems. As you mentioned, a list of our foreign representatives in Washington is now being supplied to the Foreign Relations Committee each week. We should be glad to provide for the attendance of any of these gentlemen at any meetings which the Chairman or you or other Members might wish to arrange. In addition, we should like to feel free, if we may, to make suggestions when any particular Ambassador may have information of special interest to Members of Congress.

Thank you also for bringing your broadcast address to my attention. I have obtained the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing it and will read it with much interest.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON,

Statistics of the Philippines

	1937	1938	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952
Population (millions)	15.8			19.2	19.4	19.9		
Rice (paddy) production (1,000 M tons)	12,179.0			2,335.0	2,491.0	2,606.0		
Cement production (1,000 M tons)			134.0	119.0	203.0	298.0		
Electricity (millions of kilowatt-hours)	130.8	145.2		363.6	423.6	458.6		
Copra exports (1,000 M tons)	236.5	342.1	984.0	635.7	565.5	698.0	2 750.8	3 768.6
Coconut oil exports (1,000 tons)	163.6	165.6		42.4	65.2	71.0	2 65.0	3 66.3
Abaca exports (1,000 tons)	165.3	141.3	95.0	75.2	58.3	95.0	2 125.0	3 147.5
Sugar exports (1,000 tons)	871.0	868.0		216.8	415.0	438.0	2 685.9	3 752.9
All exports f. o. b. (millions of dollars)	152.4	116.4	264.6	318.0	253.8	331.6	2 441.8	3 466.7
All imports f. o. b. (millions of dollars)	109.2	132.6	511.2	585.6	568.8	339.7	2 606.0	
Cost of living (all items as of January)	100.0			391.2	363.8	332.3	355.2	
International reserves Central Bank as of end December (millions of dollars)			389.0	400.0	230.0	295.0	2 296.7	
International reserves Central Bank and all other banks as of end December (millions of dollars) ⁷			442.0	409.0	260.0	356.0	3 393.0	
Government revenues exclusive of loans (millions of pesos by fiscal year)	228.1	136.9	144.0	250.0	311.0	273.0	2 335.8	629.3
Government expenditures (millions of pesos by fiscal year)	113.8	144.8	361.0	357.8	425.1	502.2	543.3	619.7
Appropriations for armed forces (millions of pesos by fiscal year)	16.1	19.1	77.8	77.0	54.8	90.4	137.1	176.0
Appropriations for education (millions of pesos by fiscal year)	19.9	30.7	75.3	71.3	122.4	140.7	142.9	2 143.0
Armed forces strength—officers and enlisted men (thousands)						50.0	9 54.6	10 60.7
Enrollment in public and private elementary and secondary schools (millions)	11 1.86		3.7	4.3				

1 Average 1934-38.

2 Estimated.

3 Estimated, fiscal year.

4 Estimated cost, insurance, and freight.

5 1941.

6 End of March.

7 NOTE—Particular attention is invited to this item.

8 End of May.

9 July planned.

10 January planned.

11 1939.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 5, line 4, and in line 8.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by request, I ask that amendment go over. The next amendment to be taken up is in line 17, on page 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration," on page 5, line 17, after the word "area," to strike out "\$1,275,000" and insert "\$1,255,712, of which not to exceed \$900,712 shall be available for personal services."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I wonder whether the Senator from Arizona will be kind enough to yield to me for a brief statement. I note, on page 20 of the report, certain items in which the people and representatives of Kansas feel particularly interested. I note particularly the item "Bostwick division Nebraska-Kansas." The budget estimate for the fiscal year 1952 is \$1,982,300, and the amount recommended by the Senate committee is \$1,900,000. I would appreciate any

comment the Senator from Arizona might wish to make regarding that item.

Mr. HAYDEN. A slight reduction was made, because we were not appropriating the full amount of the budget estimate. The description of that project is:

The development of the irrigable land of the division is planned to be in five separate subunits totaling approximately 90,000 acres. Harlan County Dam and Reservoir, constructed by the Corps of Engineers, will provide the major portion of irrigation water for the project. Three diversion dams and seven main gravity canals will be constructed. Additional lands will receive water through construction of four pumping plants and pump canal systems. The Lovewell Dam and Reservoir located near Lovewell, Kans., will impound the waters of White Rock Creek for multiple purpose use and serve as a supplementary water supply for the Courtland Canal. A complete system of laterals and drains is planned for the Bostwick division.

That is the description given in the justification for this project. The committee understood that the dam and reservoir were practically complete. Therefore, there is no reason why there should not be an extension to take care of farm lands under cultivation.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. With reference to the Smoky Hill division, the Cedar Bluff unit, the amount estimated by the Bureau for 1952 is \$1,310,141. The Senate committee recommends \$500,000. I should like to state that very recently the Bureau dedicated this new dam. The Commissioner was in attendance. It is a very fine project. The flood-control features of the dam are already in use, and are giving great benefit to that sec-

tion. I was interested in the item of \$500,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. We followed the recommendation of the Bureau to the effect that the money allowed in the bill would be a fair proportion of the total expenditures made. The justification reads as follows:

The Cedar Bluff unit will irrigate 11,500 acres of farm land. In addition, provision for flood-control storage in the Cedar Bluff Reservoir will allow irrigation storage downstream and an additional 41,000 acres below Kanopolis Dam in Ellsworth, McPherson, and Saline Counties, Kans., will be irrigated by the existing Kanopolis Reservoir. The unit facilities include the Cedar Bluff Dam and Reservoir, on the Smoky Hill River, with a gross storage capacity of 473,850 acre-feet; the Cedar Bluff Canal, and a lateral system to serve the unit farm lands.

Mr. CARLSON. If the Senator will yield further, I note in the report a table with reference to the Upper Republican division. The Bureau recommends \$334,443, and the Senate committee recommends \$134,000. I wonder if the distinguished Senator can give us any information on that point.

Mr. HAYDEN. I might explain to the Senator from Kansas, in connection with these reductions, that neither the House committee nor the House itself allowed the full amount of the budget estimates. We have not done so. The committee arrived at the amount allowed in undertaking to make proper apportionment among the projects. The justification reads as follows:

The unit consists of the 175,000 acre-feet Bonny Dam flood control and storage reservoir; the St. Francis and Hale Canals, and lateral and distribution systems for the irrigation of 6,520 acres of land.

Construction of Bonny Dam was initiated in December 1948, and as of June 30, 1950, this feature was 68.6 percent complete. The fiscal year 1951 program will consist of a continuation of construction on the dam and related reservoir facilities. Construction has not been started on canal and lateral systems.

Mr. CARLSON. I want the Senator from Arizona to know that I appreciate very much the information he has furnished. There is a breakdown, which, as I understand, shows another phase of the construction of such projects. The Solomon division, in Kansas, has suffered bad floods within the past 60 days, and the Solomon and Saline Rivers have both been above the usual stage.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator will understand that the projects in the Missouri Basin have been divided into phase A, which indicates projects which are ready for construction or under construction, and phase B, those which are still in the planning stage. They could not all be undertaken at once. The Kirwin Dam will create a reservoir with a gross storage capacity of 200,000 acre-feet, which will provide for the irrigation of 11,500 acres of land located on the north and south sides of the Solomon River, as well as downstream flood and silt-control benefits. The irrigation system for the irrigable area will consist of 45 miles of main canals, 33 miles of laterals, and an 11,500-acre drainage system.

Those projects are all in the planning stage. The bill provides money to carry

on the planning and to get them ready so that at the proper time construction may be begun. It is to be regretted that at this time the reservoir is not in existence. If it had been, it could have held back 200,000 acre-feet of water and much of the damage would not have occurred.

Mr. CARLSON. If I correctly understand the report, the committee recommends no funds for the commencement of new projects. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much the Senator's statement.

Mr. HAYDEN. That was not my personal recommendation, but that is what the committee recommended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment beginning in line 17, on page 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 19, to insert:

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FACILITIES, DENISON DAM PROJECT

The jurisdiction and control of the Denison-Payne 132-kilovolt transmission line is hereby vested in the Secretary of the Interior, and the interdepartmental accounts shall be adjusted accordingly.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative provisions," on page 6, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "fifteen" and insert "eight", and in line 4, after the word "vehicles", to strike out the comma and "of which eight shall be."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Commission of Fine Arts—Salaries and expenses," on page 6, line 18, after the word "Commission", to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$14,530."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bonneville Power Administration—Construction," on page 6, line 23, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$62,000,000" and insert "\$67,500,000, of which not to exceed \$3,387,470 shall be available for personal services, and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Operation and maintenance," on page 7, line 6, after the word "energy", to strike out "\$5,250,000" and insert "\$5,368,439, of which not to exceed \$3,983,862 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative provisions," on page 7, line 16, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "of which 12 shall be."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Land Management—Management of lands and resources," on page 8, line 10, after the word "Management", to strike out "\$6,900,000, of which \$1,200,000 shall be used for soil and moisture conservation", and insert "\$7,722,605, of which not to exceed \$4,864,096 shall be available for personal services."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask that that item be passed over, at the request of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 16, to insert:

CONSTRUCTION

For construction of access roads on the revested Oregon & California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands; acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads adjacent to such lands; to remain available until expended, \$995,000, of which not to exceed \$45,000 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated herein for road construction shall be transferred to the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative provisions," on page 9, line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "thirty-two" and insert "twenty-five."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Indian Affairs," on page 11, after line 17, to strike out:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, \$65,000,000, to be available in not to exceed the amounts indicated respectively for the following purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 21, to insert a new subhead, as follows:

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE SERVICES

In line 23, before the word "For", to strike out "Health, education, and welfare services."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I might explain, Mr. President, that the House provided in the bill for the full budget estimate recommended for all purposes and placed an over-all limitation so as to leave it within the discretion of the Bureau of Indian Affairs as to where the cut should be applied. The committee decided it did not think it was proper for Congress to grant that discretion to an administrative officer. We preferred to go through the bill and take up each item and determine what to do with it. That is what we have done. That is the reason why the over-all limitation is stricken out.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I had intended to ask a question along that line. Simply supplementing what the Senator has already said, the individual appropriations made under the several heads, then, approximate the total in the leading paragraph which the committee eliminates?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. The House allocations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs exceeded the total amount by \$65,000,000 appropriated. The Senate committee thought that \$65,000,000 was too drastic a cut below the Budget Bureau's estimates, and so recommended more than that, but still did not allow the full sum requested by the Budget Bureau.

Mr. CASE. In looking at the individual paragraphs it appears to me that

the items are somewhat reduced from the figures used by the House.

Mr. HAYDEN. The figures used by the House are the Budget estimates. In most cases the appropriations recommended by the Senate committee did not meet the Budget estimates. If the Senator from South Dakota will indulge me, I will tell him the difference.

Mr. CASE. The Senator's statement clarifies the situation. In other words, the total figure which the House used was less than the sum total of the individual figures they had in the various paragraphs.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is exactly correct.

Mr. CASE. And what the committee did was to make application to the specific paragraph rather than to leave it for the Commissioner to make his own application.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. The House allowed the Budget estimate for the several appropriations, but placed the over-all limitation of \$65,000,000. The committee recommended that the over-all limitation be deleted, and provided what seemed to be proper and essential appropriations, with a total amount not as high as the budget estimate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 8, after the word "museum", to strike out "\$43,600,000" and insert "\$41,180,000, of which not to exceed \$23,699,661 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 10, to insert a new subhead, as follows: "Resources management."

In line 12, before the word "For", to strike out "Resources management."

And in line 22, after the word "exhibits", to strike out "\$11,400,000" and insert "\$10,921,360, of which not to exceed \$6,843,485 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 13, to insert a new subhead, as follows: "Construction."

In line 2, before the word "For", to strike out "Construction."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the next amendment, in lines 7, 8, and 9, I will ask to go over at the request of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The Secretary will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 19, to insert a new subhead, as follows: "General administrative expenses."

In line 21, before the word "For", to strike out "General administrative expenses"; and in line 23, after the word "offices", to strike out "\$3,600,000" and insert "\$3,300,747, of which not to exceed \$2,693,281 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 2, to insert a new subhead, as follows: "Revolving fund for loans."

And in line 4, before the word "For", to strike out "Revolving fund for loans."

The amendment was agreed to:

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 8, to insert a new subhead, as follows: "Payment to Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians, Oklahoma."

In line 12, before the word "For", to strike out "Payment to Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians, Oklahoma"; and in line 17, after "Congress)", to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$22,655, of which not to exceed \$21,105 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative provisions," on page 14, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "one hundred and ninety-one passenger motor vehicles, of which one hundred and ninety-one shall be for replacement only" and insert "one hundred and twenty-five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Tribal funds," on page 17, line 2, after the word "Provided", to strike out "further", and insert "however"; and in line 3, after the word "appropriation", to insert "or other tribal funds."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Reclamation—General investigations," on page 18, line 2, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$4,000,000," and insert "\$4,600,000, of which not to exceed \$3,163,396 shall be available for personal services, and."

Mr. HAYDEN. That amendment is to go over at the request of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The Secretary will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 18, in line 4, after the word "which", to strike out "\$3,500,000" and insert "\$3,903,500."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that amendment is also to be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The Secretary will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction and rehabilitation," on page 18, line 21, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$197,000,000" and insert "\$208,344,450, of which not to exceed \$29,160,408 shall be available for personal services, and."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to that amendment, and then ask that it go over and remain pending. I ask that the amendment to the committee amendment which I now offer may be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, line 21, in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert the following: "\$220,370,450, of which not to exceed \$29,160,408 shall be available for personal services, and."

On page 18, line 23, in lieu of the figure proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert "\$33,896,650."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in explanation of what I propose to do, I may say that in my opinion we should not approve of the "no new starts" policy adopted by the Bureau of the Budget during the past two fiscal years with respect to appropriations for the development of the natural resources of the Nation. As a result of that policy the sums made available for the four major development agencies out of the total appropriations of \$81,402,455,787 for the fiscal year 1951 were for reclamation 0.33 percent, for flood control and river harbors 0.76 percent, for soil conservation 0.41 percent, and for highways 0.47 percent, or a total of less than 2 percent, being actually 1.98 percent of the total appropriations made last year for those four purposes.

The curtailment of such internal improvement projects has been justified by the Bureau of the Budget by asserting that labor and materials should be diverted from them to direct use in the national defense effort required by the threat of armed Communist aggression. But the threat of aggression is quite certain to exist for a considerable period of years and new wealth created from the Nation's natural resources will be greatly needed to sustain the effort to defeat it. It is therefore sound public policy to devote a reasonable part of the total Federal expenditures to capital investments in wealth producing projects which will be repaid by increased revenues derived from taxing income and profits which would otherwise not exist.

I am, therefore, offering the amendment, and I propose to have it allocated to eight different projects. It would initiate construction of these projects, for all of which estimates were submitted by the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget, and disapprove the attitude of the Bureau of the Budget toward new-starts projects. They are projects which will put to work water now going to waste to the seas to grow crops, make homes, support people, produce power for urban, rural, and industrial uses, and increase Federal revenues from taxation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record at this point a summary of the projects or units proposed, showing the amount to be allocated out of the \$12,026,000, and indicating how much money will be used on each project.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Projects or units proposed additional to budget estimates

Project or unit	Total estimated cost	Proposed for fiscal year 1952
1. Solano project, California.....	\$38,745,000	\$2,500,000
2. Palisades project, Idaho.....	76,601,000	2,500,000
3. Weber Basin project, Utah.....	63,534,000	1,000,000
4. Yakima project, Kennewick division, Washington.....	10,736,000	1,174,000
5. Riverton project, Wyoming, Muddy Ridge canal and laterals.....	4,385,670	250,000
6. Missouri River Basin project: (a) Lower Marias unit, Montana.....	64,065,000	2,500,000
(b) Sargent unit, Nebraska.....	10,671,000	1,227,000
(c) Jamestown unit, North Dakota.....	10,740,000	875,000
Additional projects or units.....	295,467,000	12,026,000

The reasons for the inclusion of appropriations for these projects may be summarized as follows:

1. Solano project, California: The \$2,500,000 recommended will enable contracts to be let to start construction of Monticello Dam to provide supplemental water for the city of Vallejo, vital defense installations, and an important irrigated food production area.

2. Palisades Dam, Idaho: The \$2,500,000 recommended will permit completion of highway relocation and initiation of construction of the dam. The Defense Electric Power Administration has approved the project which will have 112,500 kilowatts of power capacity. By supplemental water, the dam will later stabilize and increase production on 650,000 acres of irrigated land in Snake River Valley.

3. Weber Basin, Utah. The \$1,000,000 recommended for this project will enable a contract to be let to bring vitally needed water for irrigation, municipal, and defense needs to the vicinity of Ogden.

4. Kennewick division, Washington: The \$1,174,000 recommended will assure a start toward obtaining irrigated crops that are needed in a critical area of the Hanford atomic energy development where more than 30,000 new population has created a serious food problem. Both the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations have held that this division is a continuation of construction of the successful Yakima project.

5. Riverton project, Wyoming: The committee has increased the amount for this project from \$855,740 allowed by the House to \$1,150,000 to permit construction to start on the Muddy Ridge canal to serve 30,000 acres of public land that will be made available for settlement by veterans. Construction of the Riverton project has been extended over 30 years with consequent increasing costs and overhead and should be completed as rapidly as possible.

6. Missouri River Basin project—(a) Lower Marias unit, Montana: The \$2,500,000 allocation will permit award of contract for construction of the Tiber Dam for irrigation storage to stabilize agriculture in an area frequently devastated by drought where an assured supply of livestock feed is essential. An appropriation to commence construction of this project during the 1951 fiscal year was impounded by the Bureau of the Budget because of its "no new starts" policy.

(b) Sargent unit, Nebraska: The \$1,227,000 allocation will permit award of contract for the Millburn diversion dam to divert supplemental water from Middle Loup River to provide livestock feed and other irrigated crop production in an area of highly productive land greatly in need of supplemental water.

(c) Jamestown Dam, N. Dak.: The \$875,000 allocation is for initiation of construction of Jamestown Dam, urgently needed to protect the city of Jamestown from devastating floods and provide irrigation storage for future developments. A 1951 appropriation for this project was also impounded by the Budget Bureau.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the Senator advise us whether the Palisades project is included in the list he has submitted for the RECORD?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is. For the Palisades Dam in Idaho, the \$2,500,000 recommended will permit completion of highway relocation and initiation of construction of the dam. The Defense Electric Power Administration has approved the project, which will have 112,500 kilowatts of power capacity. By supplemental water, the dam will later stabilize and increase production on 650,000 acres of irrigated land in the Snake River Valley.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Arizona, as chairman of the subcommittee, has indicated that the Bureau of the Budget has withheld requests for funds for any so-called new projects. Who makes that determination? Is it the Bureau of the Budget, or the Bureau of Reclamation? Or is some authority conceded to the Appropriations Committee to determine when a certain project is in the category of new projects?

Mr. HAYDEN. The determination has actually been made by the Bureau of the Budget. Take the case of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, which I have listed. The House Committee on Appropriations, in its report, has stated that it is not a new project, but merely an extension or unit of an existing project, and a very fine one. The Senate committee so stated last year, but the Bureau of the Budget decided that it was new, and we could not do anything about it.

In the case of the Jamestown project, which is a combined flood control and irrigation project in North Dakota, last year the Congress appropriated money to begin the construction of that badly needed project. The same was true of the Marias Unit project in Montana, but the Bureau of the Budget decided that they were new starts, and the money was impounded. It is very difficult for me to say how they arrived at that conclusion, but that is what the Bureau has done.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I should like to point out that in the case of the Palisades project, the original authorization was made by the Congress in 1941. There was a reauthorization of the revised project in 1950. More than \$3,000,000 have been expended already upon their particular project, for the construction of 58 miles of transmission line to bring power to the dam site and to service the power plant after its construction; and

yet the Bureau of the Budget has taken the position that this is a new project.

Mr. HAYDEN. I may add that there is also a contract authorization of \$2,000,000 available for that project.

Mr. DWORSHAK. That was made available in 1948.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; but none of it has ever been used because the Bureau of the Budget has impounded the whole sum.

Mr. DWORSHAK. This is still considered a new project by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is so defined.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Even though, in the light of the apparent shortage of electricity in the Northwest, within the past month the Defense Electric Power Administration has granted a certificate of necessity for this particular project, stressing that it should be constructed because of the 112,000 kilowatts of power which would be generated at that point. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. It appeared to me that there was every reason in the world to appropriate some money to carry on the work on this project. It was fully justified both from the standpoint of power and irrigation development.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Apparently it was the conclusion of the Appropriations Committee, particularly the subcommittee which handled this bill, that no funds would be provided for any project, regardless of whether it is in process of construction, if the Bureau of the Budget did not make a request for funds.

Mr. HAYDEN. The items I have mentioned were all asked of the Budget by the Department of the Interior, and were all denied by the Budget.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Appropriations Committee did follow the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget with respect to these various projects, did it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee as a whole did not go above the budget estimates, or include any project not specifically mentioned in the budget.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have discussed with Mr. Tolbert, one of the clerks in the Appropriations Committee, the item of Construction and Rehabilitation on page 18, and the item of Operation and Maintenance, on page 20. I call attention further to page 23 of the committee report, dealing with the question of the All-American Canal. The amendments which I should like to propose would be to strike out, on page 18, line 21, the figure "\$208,344,450," and insert "\$208,535,000"; and on page 20, line 15, to strike out "\$1,862,000" and restore the figure "\$1,671,000." That would not increase or decrease the amount, but it would take it out of the construction fund rather than the operation and maintenance fund. That is the way it has been handled in the past, and I think it is in keeping with our general understanding.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is absolutely immaterial to me which way it is done, so long as it is done.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thought this would be the proper place to bring it up, because we have an amendment which, if adopted, would increase the amount. So I should like to offer, first, an amendment on page 18, line 21.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President; I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from California may offer his amendments now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The first amendment offered by the Senator from California will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, line 21, it is proposed to strike out "\$208,344,450", and insert "\$208,535,450."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as a corollary to that amendment, because we have increased that amount, the other item should be decreased by the same amount. I therefore offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 20, line 13, to strike out "\$16,163,594", and insert in lieu thereof "\$15,977,594," reducing the amount by \$191,000. Also on page 20, line 15, I offer an amendment to strike out "\$1,862,000" and restore the figure "\$1,671,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to make an inquiry. I understand that the committee amendments, which may be accepted today, are to be subject to amendment when the bill comes to a vote.

Mr. HAYDEN. No. The arrangement is that whenever any Senator has indicated that there might be objection to the adoption of a committee amendment—and I have inquired diligently—we are passing over such amendments temporarily. The remaining amendments, to which no objection has been made, are not being passed over. What particular amendment is the Senator interested in?

Mr. LEHMAN. I was thinking about an amendment to the committee amendment, such as that offered by the Senator from California. If I understood him correctly, his amendment does not change the amount, but changes the allocation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It changes the fund from which the amount comes. I was offering the amendment in the hope that the chairman of the committee might, in effect, modify his amendment so as not to change the general parliamentary situation. It was a necessary correction.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me make an inquiry of the Senator from California. The arrangement which we have made was recommended in the committee, because of a dispute between the Secretary of the Interior and the Imperial Irrigation district with respect to the operation and maintenance of the All-American Canal.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. The district has a contract made with the Secretary of the Interior in 1932, which authorizes it to operate and maintain the canal.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Secretary of the Interior has stated that in his opinion that contract has been abrogated by certain provisions in the Mexican Water Treaty. To bring that question to an issue the committee has recommended that for a temporary period of time funds to operate and maintain the canal be provided out of the Treasury, until about April of next year.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct. The only purpose of my amendment is to carry out the committee report, beginning at the bottom of page 23 and running to the top of page 24. It does not change the amount, but merely takes it out of the construction fund rather than the operation and maintenance fund, with no increase or decrease in the total amount, except that it comes out of the construction fund.

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee has recommended to the district and to the Secretary of the Interior that they get together and see if they can write a contract which is mutually satisfactory.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct; and to bring in the Department of Justice, in the hope that a mutually satisfactory understanding can be arrived at.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. If that cannot be done, the matter will have to be disposed of in the courts. We wanted to give them a reasonable time in which to see if they could get together. For that reason this money is proposed to be appropriated.

Mr. KNOWLAND. At any rate, this is for a temporary period of time, in the hope that they can reach a mutually satisfactory agreement.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that this particular appropriation which is proposed is to be passed over? Or is it the intention of the Senator to press for a vote this afternoon on the amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Only the amendment in relation to the \$191,000, because there may be an amendment to be proposed by the Senator from Arizona tomorrow with respect to some new projects, which would add a certain amount to the bill. I thought that from a sound parliamentary procedural standpoint, the minor item of \$191,000 ought to be included now, so that we shall be acting on the proper total when we vote tomorrow, rather than to have the situation further confused.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is just the matter on which I wish enlightenment. I do not know that I would oppose any part of this amendment, but I had not seen the bill until this morning. I was wondering whether the committee amendment was to be passed over, or whether it was intended that it should be voted upon today.

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee amendment will be passed over.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment which I have offered, and which will be passed over, so that the amount will be increased in each instance by \$191,000.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That will be satisfactory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CASE. Reserving the right to object—and I am making my reservation only to get the matter clear in my mind—I am plagued in parliamentary situations by remembering the precedents of the House rather than those of the Senate. In the House, if the figure of \$208,000,000 were once amended, it would not be subject to further amendment, and I am wondering whether the amendment offered by the Senator from California, if agreed to, would be open to further amendment by the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HAYDEN. The whole amount, which I have offered in my amendment, would be pending. In that case the amount provided for by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] would be included in my amount.

Mr. CASE. It would be included in the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator would not be foreclosed from offering another amendment.

Mr. CASE. If by any chance the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona should not be agreed to, the Senator from California could still offer his amendment as an original amendment to the provision in the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; we will take care of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do I understand correctly that a portion of the appropriation is provided for what is described as the Arizona-California All-American Canal?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. The money we are talking about now relates primarily to operation and maintenance of the All-American Canal.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How much has the Senate authorized for the project?

Mr. HAYDEN. The project has been practically completed. The amount proposed is merely for operating it until next spring.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How much money is the Senate authorizing for it in the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no construction money involved. I understand what the Senator has in mind. What the Senator has in mind relates to the Coachella division. The Coachella canal is an extension of the All-American Canal beyond Imperial Valley. The project could be completed within a year. However, there is a dispute between the district and the Reclamation Bureau as to the amount to be paid. The district claims that the whole work shall be done for \$13,500,000. The Reclamation Service, under legal advice, says it cannot make a contract for that amount, and that whatever money is expended must be fully reimbursed. We have provided some money in the bill so that the work may be finished, but our directive is to the effect that the question shall be

taken to court immediately to see whether or not the United States is obligated.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If I understand correctly, about \$3,000,000 is provided for that project in the bill, which is not recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. So the recommendation is approximately \$3,000,000 over the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A few moments ago I understood the chairman of the subcommittee to say that he did not think he had exceeded the budget estimates in any of the items.

Mr. HAYDEN. No. The Senator from Delaware misunderstood me. I said we had not exceeded the budget estimates with respect to reclamation as a whole. Some of the items are below the budget estimates, some are above the budget estimates, and some are the same as the budget estimates. We had to deal with the subject in a practical way.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the amendment of the Senator which is to be brought up tomorrow is adopted, it will just about wipe out all the savings the committee made in the budget estimates.

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, no. What would happen with respect to the Bureau of Reclamation would be that the 1952 budget estimates, including a supplementary estimate of \$400,000 received by the Senate, which was disallowed, would be \$252,475,000. The House approved \$222,094,000. The committee recommends \$234,991,247, which amount is \$36,552,753 less than was appropriated for the fiscal year 1951, and it is \$17,483,753 less than the 1952 budget estimates.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is now speaking about the Bureau as a whole. I am speaking about pages 15 and 16 of the report.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the item to which I have reference.

Mr. WILLIAMS. On page 16 of the report it is stated that the budget estimate for the fiscal year 1952 is \$224,090,000. The Senate committee provides for \$208,344,450. I understand that an amendment is now pending which would raise the amount to a figure which would just about restore the cuts which the committee made in the budget estimates.

Mr. HAYDEN. The amount would still be more than \$4,000,000 under the budget estimates.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But it would restore substantially all of the cuts which the committee had made.

Mr. HAYDEN. A very large part of them, yes.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. Do I understand that the Senate has passed the investi-

gations item of the Bureau of Reclamation?

Mr. HAYDEN. It passed it over.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder whether the Senator from Utah would yield so that we may dispose of the item under discussion.

Mr. WATKINS. I merely wished to make inquiry with respect to this subject, because I propose to offer an amendment to the particular item of general investigations. I am wondering whether I am precluded from doing so by what has happened today?

Mr. HAYDEN. The subject has been passed over.

Mr. WATKINS. Then an amendment could be properly offered tomorrow, or any other day?

Mr. HAYDEN. I asked that it be passed over at the request of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. WATKINS. The item appears on page 17 of the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am informed by the clerk of the committee that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has no further objection to the consideration of the item. Does the Senator from Utah wish to offer an amendment?

Mr. WATKINS. I received a copy of the bill only a few moments ago. Under certain contingencies, which I shall explain to the Senator, I may wish to offer an amendment. I understand the Senator will offer an amendment tomorrow, to include certain projects which were not included in the bill as it came from the House.

Mr. HAYDEN. Not to that item. The item I intend to amend is on page 18, lines 21, 22, and 23.

Mr. WATKINS. If the Senator's amendment is adopted I shall not desire to offer an amendment to the particular item of general investigations. However, if the amendment should not be adopted I shall wish to offer an amendment to that item.

Mr. HAYDEN. We can pass over the amendment in lines 2 and 3 on page 18 until we see what happens to the amendment in lines 21, 22, and 23 on page 18.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In other words, the effect of what has been done is to modify the committee amendment to the extent of \$191,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment goes over. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 23, after the word "which," to strike out "\$29,202,200" and insert "\$28,972,-650."

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask that the amendment go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment will be stated.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask that the next amendment go over from the point where the language is stricken, beginning at line 24 on page 18, to line 13 on page 19.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will go over.

Mr. HAYDEN. Following the proviso in line 13 on page 19, I find that the language relates to agreements between the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and

Colorado. That amendment can be agreed to, beginning with the word "Provided" on line 13, and ending on line 2 of page 20.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 19, line 13, after the colon, it is proposed to insert: "Provided further, That in order to promote agreement among the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado, and to avoid any possible alteration of existing vested water rights, no part of this or of any prior appropriation shall be used for construction or for further commitment for construction of the Glendo unit or any feature thereof, until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado, and approved by Congress: *Provided further*, That no part of this or prior appropriations shall be used for construction, nor for further commitments to construction of Moorhead Dam and Reservoir, Mont., or any feature thereof until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of Wyoming and Montana, and approved by the Congress."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Do I understand that the so-called Keating amendment is going over?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. CASE. I ask the Senator whether the modification proposed by the committee is clarifying in nature, in that it adds to the language used in the Keating amendment the words:

Except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities which the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customers.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from South Dakota is correct. We retained the words of the original Keating amendment, and made these exceptions, so as to make the amendment workable. Otherwise, without the exceptions, the Federal Government could not build a transmission line to carry out contracts already made with private utilities.

Mr. CASE. As the Senator knows, I appeared before the committee, and that was one of the points I sought to make before the committee. So far as I can observe, the committee has done a good job in clarifying the amendment and making it workable.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator raised a question about it, and we told him we would pass over the amendment. I myself think it is in good shape.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I desire to have the Record show that, with respect to the amendment beginning on page 19, in line 13, prohibiting the expenditure of any appropriations provided in the bill or made prior hereto for construction of either the Glendo project, in the State

of Wyoming, or the Moorhead Dam and Reservoir, in the State of Montana is designed for the purpose of making it possible for the two States concerned in each instance, namely, the States of Wyoming and the State of Nebraska in the case of the Glendo Reservoir, and the State of Wyoming and the State of Montana in the case of the Moorhead Reservoir, to examine the report. The purpose is to prevent the expenditure of funds to initiate a project the entire scope of which has not as yet been laid before the people of both States.

The purpose of the amendment, which has been adopted to previous bills, is to aid in carrying on the work of the Federal Water Authority and the Bureau of Reclamation and the State water authorities in determining the best use of the waters of interstate streams.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Arizona knows that during the course of their consideration and preparation of the bill, I appeared informally before the committee to discuss the water situation at the Rapid City Air Force Base, in connection with the Rapid Valley project. I have noted the paragraphs included by the committee on page 22 of its report, and I wish to express my appreciation for the consideration the committee gave to this matter.

I may say to the distinguished Senator from Arizona that following my informal talk with the members of the committee, I communicated with the commanding officer of the air base, and I now have from him a letter dated June 28, 1951, which, if anything, makes clear that I made an understatement to the committee as to the amount of money which might be saved, for although I was correct in stating that the cost of the wells is \$193,000 each, I did not have with me at that time the cost of the pumps, namely, \$22,000 for each well, or the cost of cleaning the wells, which will amount to \$80,000 a well, and the wells must be cleaned once a year on the average. Neither did I have available to me then the cost of the filtration plant, namely, \$360,000. All those costs may be obviated if the project is carried out along the lines described to the committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the Record, for the information and reference of the committee, the letter I have received from the commanding officer of the Rapid City Air Force Base.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HEADQUARTERS, TWENTY-EIGHTH
STRATEGIC RECONNAISSANCE WING,
HEAVY, RAPID CITY AIR FORCE BASE,
Weaver, S. Dak., June 28, 1951,

HON. FRANCIS CASE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: In reference to your letter of June 21, 1951, with attached memorandum of June 20, 1951, on the subject of the Rapid Valley project, I am forwarding, in compliance with your request, information which I believe will both supplement and correct certain portions of the memorandum.

We have at present three deep wells in operation, which are of an average depth of 4,200 feet. A fourth well is now being sunk, while two more are under consideration with respect to siting and fiscal programming.

Current water consumption of 1,000,000 gallons per day, with a normal increase to 1,500,000 gallons during July and August, will absorb our total water gallonage in storage in less than 2 days unless stringent water-conservation measures are effected at the time of pump failure.

This estimated normal increase does not include the Wherry housing or the 21 new barrack, BOQ, and mess hall buildings now under construction. We have also been asked to begin site planning on 22 additional barrack buildings, which will further increase our water requirements.

In regard to costs of our water-producing operation, the cost for a new well with pumps and connecting lines was correctly quoted at \$193,000. It may be of interest to note that the pumps being located near the bottom of the well casing (the pumps can push the water much farther than they can pull it) cost twenty-odd-thousand dollars, and require occasional replacement. Cleaning the wells of sand and mineral deposits approximates \$80,000. While certain of our wells require cleaning more often than others, a fair average would be once per year.

I might further add that due to the highly mineralized content of this water a \$360,000 filtration plant to reduce the mineralization has been programmed for fiscal 1952 funds. Then, too, our entire base plumbing system is presenting problems here and there as a result of this mineralization.

It is quite obvious that our water-producing operation is quite costly under these conditions and an over-all saving could be realized if cold, comparatively soft water could be furnished from Rapid City sources. The cost of the filtration plant alone is estimated to cover more than half the cost of a pipeline from Rapid City to the base.

I trust this information will be of assistance, and in the event further statistics are desired, please advise.

Sincerely,

RICHARD E. ELLSWORTH,
Colonel, USAF, Commanding.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, in connection with the foregoing letter, the appropriate part of the committee report, on page 22.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHEYENNE DIVISION, WYOMING-SOUTH
DAKOTA, RAPID VALLEY UNIT

The Rapid Valley unit of the Cheyenne division, Wyoming-South Dakota, is under phase B (advance planning) and is included in the Bureau's 1952 program. To the overall figure recommended by the committee for the Missouri River Basin, the committee has added \$185,000, which amount is earmarked for further advance planning on this project.

The Rapid City Air Force Base is east of Rapid City, S. Dak., and will be in need of an additional water supply. The committee was advised that the Air Force in lieu of digging additional wells would prefer to get water by gravity mains from Rapid City. The committee was further advised that the city can supply water from its present sources for about 3 to 5 years but that neither the city nor the Air Force would feel safe in contracting on this basis unless there is a reasonable prospect that the second reservoir in the Rapid Valley project, the Pactola Reservoir, is built. The committee

feels that this project should go forward as rapidly as possible in order to provide an additional water supply for the Air Force base near Rapid City, as well as for the other purposes for which the project is planned, and has specifically included \$185,000 in the bill to continue the planning on the project in order that it may be made ready for moving into the construction phase. When the planning has advanced to such a stage as to permit, and if the reports are favorable, the Congress should be advised by the Reclamation Bureau and a budget estimate submitted to start construction on this project. In the absence of being able to obtain water from Rapid City, the committee was advised that the Air Force base will need four or five additional wells at an additional cost of approximately \$1,000,000. The committee is appropriating for the Rapid Valley project with the definite understanding that this additional \$1,000,000 will not be spent by the Air Force to obtain an additional water supply.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am glad to have those matters printed in the RECORD. The committee was much impressed with the presentation originally made by the Senator from South Dakota that if the plan was carried out, the expenditure of \$1,000,000 for wells could be avoided.

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. We now understand from the Senator from South Dakota that the amount which may be saved may be even greater.

Mr. CASE. I think that is true, because the original estimates did not include estimates for the cost for some housing which is already under construction or for two groups of barracks which, when constructed, will result in an increase of the demand for water, and will make the situation even more compelling than I was able to state that it would be.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Operation and maintenance," on page 20, line 13, after the word "law", to strike out "\$15,094,000" and insert "\$16,168,594"; in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "not to exceed \$12,592,900" and insert "\$12,476,494"; in line 15, after the word "and", to strike out "not to exceed \$1,671,000" and insert "\$1,862,000"; and in line 16, after the word "fund", to insert "and of which not to exceed \$10,331,434 shall be available for personal services."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, all amendments under the heading "Operation and maintenance" should go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments just stated will be passed over.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General administrative expenses," on page 21, line 5, after the word "Reclamation", to strike out "\$5,500,000" and insert "\$5,478,203 of which not to exceed \$4,696,178 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Emergency fund," on page 21, line 19, after "(43 U. S. C. 502)", to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 21, to insert:

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FACILITIES, FORT PECK PROJECT, MONTANA

The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to transfer to the Department of the Interior without exchange of funds, all of the right, title, and interest of the Department of the Army in and to the following facilities, including rights-of-way (except that portion of the rights-of-way within the Fort Peck Reservoir area), but there shall be reserved the right to use the power facilities for the purpose of transmitting power to the Fort Peck project during emergency periods when the Fort Peck power plant is not functioning: (a) the Fort Peck-Rainbow (Great Falls) 161 kilovolt transmission line; (b) the Rainbow (Great Falls) terminal facilities; and (c) the Fort Peck-Whately 50 kilovolt transmission line and substation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative provisions," on page 23, line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$30,000" and insert "\$50,000"; in line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$50" and insert "\$100."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator why he is changing the figure from \$50 to \$100?

Mr. HAYDEN. Because the figure has been carried at \$100 a day for many years in this bill, and that rate is the same as the one which is allowed for consultants to the Corps of Army Engineers. If they wish to get the best, they should be able to pay for the best.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is that authority supposed to be used for employing expert engineers, and so forth?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. We had an illustration last year of the necessity for this allowance, in the case of some difficulty which was encountered in the case of foundation conditions at the Harlem Dam, in the State of Nebraska, where it was believed that the expenditure of a very large sum of money would be required in order to rearrange the foundations, because of the rock formation encountered there. The proper expert was called in, and he pointed out how the matter could be handled, and in that way he saved enough money on that job to pay for all the experts who will be needed for the next 15 or 20 years. In other words, in order to obtain the best information, we should employ the best experts.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think it might be well to suggest that perhaps there is something a little wrong with the experts who already are on our payroll. Perhaps we should get rid of some of them.

Mr. HAYDEN. I would not say that, because those in the Corps of Army Engineers are outstanding and of well-recognized ability.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 23, in line 23, after the word "areas", to strike out "as authorized by law" and insert "and investigation and recovery of archeological and paleontological remains in such areas in the same manner as prescribed for in the act of August 21, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 461-467)"; on page 24, line 6, after the word "except",

to strike out "\$5,500,000 under the head"; and in line 7, after the word "and", to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "amounts provided."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$1,684,000" and insert "\$2,783,000"; in line 5, after the word "be", to strike out "available for expenditure toward" and insert "expended for"; in line 8, after the word "that", to strike out "prior thereto contractual arrangements satisfactory to the Secretary shall be made for repayment of" and insert "any"; in line 10, after the word "sums," to insert "thereof"; in line 12, after the word "Coachella", to insert "Valley"; and in line 13, after the word "States", to insert "shall be repayable by said district to the United States unless said district shall be judicially determined to be not liable therefor."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendment in line 3, on page 26, go over until tomorrow.

Mr. HAYDEN. Does the Senator refer to the amount?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. That amendment can be carried over until tomorrow, can it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; if the Senator so desires.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to have that done, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the items to be passed over in that connection include the committee amendments to and including line 15, on page 26.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Those amendments will be passed over.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Geological Survey—Surveys, investigations, and research," on page 27, line 16, after the word "activities", to strike out "\$21,900,000" and insert "\$21,300,000, of which not to exceed \$13,455,000 shall be available for personal services, and."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that amendment should go over, at the request of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Mines—Conservation and development of mineral resources," on page 29, line 10, after the word "owners", to strike out "\$17,950,000" and insert "\$17,587,203, of which not to exceed \$10,639,175 shall be available for personal services."

Mr. HAYDEN. This amendment also should go over, at the request of the Senator from Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction," on page 30, line 8, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$1,250,000" and insert "\$1,587,412, of which not to exceed \$113,287 shall be available for personal services."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that amendment should go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General administrative expenses," on page 30, line 13, after the word "offices", to strike out "\$1,290,000" and insert "\$1,176,841, of which not to exceed \$1,018,434 shall be available for personal services."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that amendment should be adopted; it provides for the 10-percent cut.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Park Service—Management and protection," on page 32, line 10, after the figures "\$7,735,000", to insert "of which not to exceed \$6,584,342 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities," on page 32, line 22, after the word "Service", to strike out "\$7,300,000" and insert "\$7,369,790, of which not to exceed \$4,193,747 shall be available for personal services."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that amendment should go over, at the request of the Senator from Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction," on page 33, line 7, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$11,975,000" and insert "\$11,370,000, of which not to exceed \$945,000 shall be available for personal services, and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General administrative expenses," on page 33, line 19, after the word "offices", to strike out "\$1,284,500" and insert "\$1,171,774, of which not to exceed \$1,014,538 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Fish and Wildlife Service—Management of resources," on page 34, line 18, after the word "Service", to strike out "\$6,870,000" and insert "\$6,606,558, of which not to exceed \$4,259,363 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Investigations of resources," on page 35, line 4, after the word "law", to strike out "\$3,875,000" and insert "\$3,858,986, of which not to exceed \$2,487,629 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for investigations, surveys, studies, trapping or similar work in foreign countries."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that amendment should go over, at the request of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction," on page 35, line 16, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$750,000" and insert "\$733,742, of which not to exceed \$146,324 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General administrative expenses," on page 35, line 21, after the word "offices", to strike out "\$882,000" and insert "\$806,631, of which not to exceed \$678,319 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Territories—Administration of Territories," on page 37, after line 8, to strike out:

For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, for expenditure as authorized by law, \$7,020,000.

And in lieu thereof, to insert the following:

For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including expenses of the offices of the Governors of Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, as authorized by law (48 U. S. C., secs. 61, 531, 1422, 1431a (c)), expenses of the Government of the Virgin Islands including the agricultural station, as authorized by law (48 U. S. C. 1405, 7 U. S. C. 386g), and expenses of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands appointed pursuant to the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress; compensation and mileage of members of the legislatures in Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and American Samoa as authorized by law (48 U. S. C., secs. 87, 599, 1421d (e), and 1431a (c)); compensation and expenses of the judiciary in American Samoa as authorized by law (48 U. S. C. 1431a (c)) and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress; care of insane as authorized by law for Alaska (48 U. S. C. 46-50); grants to the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, in addition to current local revenues, for support of governmental functions; and not to exceed \$50,000 for personal services, household equipment and furnishings, and utilities necessary in the operation of the several Governors' houses; \$7,020,000, of which not to exceed \$811,865 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That the Territorial and local governments of the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands are authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That appropriations available for the Administration of Territories, including the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, may be expended for the purchase, maintenance, and operation of not to exceed four aircraft, 1 AK and 6 AKL type surface vessels, and such minor vessels as may be required, for official purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found by the Secretary to be necessary in carrying out the provisions of Article 6 (2) of the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that amendment should go over, at the request of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Alaska public works," on page 39, line 7, after the numerals "1955", to strike out "\$7,000,000" and insert "\$8,500,000"; in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$500,000" and

insert "\$463,000"; and in line 8, after the word "expenses", to insert "and of which not to exceed \$333,000 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction of roads, Alaska," on page 39, line 16, after the figures "\$20,000,000," to insert "of which not to exceed \$2,493,000 shall be available for personal services, and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Operation and maintenance of roads, Alaska," on page 39, line 22, after the word "trails", to strike out "\$2,600,000" and insert "\$2,900,000 of which not to exceed \$1,935,840 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative provisions," on page 40, line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "25" and insert "20."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Virgin Islands public works," on page 41, line 13, after "(58 Stat. 827)", to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$992,970, of which not to exceed \$63,270 shall be available for personal services"; and in line 18, after the word "projects", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the waterfront development project on Saint Thomas, and the amount included in the 1952 budget estimates for this project is hereby made available for school and hospital facilities in the Virgin Islands."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administration, Department of the Interior—Salaries and expenses," on page 42, line 5, after the word "service", to strike out "\$2,000,000", and insert "\$2,154,911, of which not to exceed \$1,890,798 shall be available for personal services."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask that that go over until tomorrow.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On request, the amendment will go over.

The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General provisions—Department of the Interior," on page 44, line 13, after the word "remain", to strike out "unused" and insert "unobligated"; in line 14, after the figures "30", to strike out "1951" and insert "1952"; and in the same line, after the word "rescinded", to strike out the comma and "except public works in the Virgin Islands."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 15, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 109. Transfers to the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 of property, other than real, excess to the needs of Federal agencies may be made at the request of the Secretary without reimbursement or transfer of funds when required by the Department for operations conducted in the Territories and the trust territory of the Pacific Islands.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Virgin Islands Corporation—Revolving fund," on page 45, line 6, after the word "law", to strike out "\$1,800,000" and insert "\$2,595,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—General provision," on page 46, after line 14, to strike out:

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 301. No part of the money appropriated by this act or made available for expenditure by the Virgin Islands Corporation which is in excess of 75 percent of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by the Department of the Interior or the Virgin Islands Corporation during such fiscal year in the performance of—

(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material,

shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, after line 17, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance), unless such appropriation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the compensation of employees performing such duties.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, after line 24, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 303. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of 1 such employee to 115, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service

examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, after line 13, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 304. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence, and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That in cases of emergency, caused by fire, flood, storm, act of God, or sabotage, persons may be employed for periods of not more than 30 days and be paid salaries and wages without the necessity of inquiring into their membership in any organization.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, would the Senator from Arizona be willing to let this go over until tomorrow? I was thinking that perhaps it would be better.

Mr. HAYDEN. These are the amendments which were adopted by the Senate in connection with the independent offices appropriation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is the language the same as the language of those amendments?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well, then. I had not had time to examine them.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Can the Senator from Arizona tell me if the ratio of 1 personnel director to each 115 persons is in accord with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not know the origin of the recommendation, but it is what the Senate has adopted previously

in connection with other appropriation bills.

Mr. CASE. It runs in my mind that that is about what it is. I call attention to it because we are implementing one of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, which was that the ratio of personnel directors, or persons in charge of personnel work, should not be excessive in proportion to the number of employees of whom they have charge.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 50, to strike out:

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation or authorizations contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

(b) to positions filled from within the agency;

(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

(d) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies and school teachers in the Indian Service;

(e) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2;

(f) to law enforcement officers:

Provided further, That when any department or agency covered in this act shall, as a result of the operation of this amendment, reduce their employment to a figure not exceeding 80 percent of the total number on their rolls as of July 1, 1951, such amendment shall cease to apply and said 80 percent figure shall become a ceiling for employment during the fiscal year 1952 and if exceeded at any time during fiscal year 1952 this amendment shall again become operative.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 51, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 305. In order to effect reductions equivalent to 10 percent or more in personal service budget estimates, excepting operation and maintenance personnel, the following reductions below the 1952 budget estimates have been made in the following appropriations in the amounts indicated:

Enforcement of Connally Hot Oil Act, \$15,330.

Power and energy studies, New England and New York, \$24,1000.

Southeastern Power Administration:

Construction, \$499,980.

Operation and maintenance, \$115,200.

Southwestern Power Administration:

Construction, \$65,200.

Operation and maintenance, \$44,263.

Commission of Fine Arts, \$2,015.

Bonneville Power Administration:

Construction, \$931,941.

Operation and maintenance, \$131,561.

Bureau of Land Management:

Management of Lands and Resources, \$326,295.

Construction, \$5,000.

Bureau of Indian Affairs:

Health, education, and welfare services, \$164,100.

Resources management, \$451,140.

Construction, \$316,896.

General administrative expenses, \$299,263.

Payments to Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, \$2,345.

Bureau of Reclamation:

General investigations, \$351,488.

Construction and rehabilitation, \$3,240,045.

Operation and maintenance, \$116,406.

General administrative expenses, \$521,797.

Geological Survey:

Surveys, investigations, and research, \$1,495,000.

Bureau of Mines:

Conservation and development of mineral resources, \$1,112,797.

Construction, \$12,588.

General administrative expenses, \$113,159.

National Park Service:

Management and protection, \$414,936.

Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities, \$26,710.

Construction, \$105,000.

General administrative expenses, \$112,726.

Fish and Wildlife Service:

Management of resources, \$191,804.

Investigations of resources, \$187,014.

Construction, \$16,258.

General administrative expenses, \$75,369.

Office of Territories:

Administration of Territories, \$90,207.

Alaska public works, \$37,000.

Construction of roads, Alaska, \$277,000.

Operation and maintenance of roads, Alaska, \$34,160.

Virgin Islands public works, \$7,030.

Administration, Department of the Interior:

Salaries and expenses, \$210,089.

Nothing in this section shall be construed to effect greater reductions in personal services than have been made in the individual appropriation paragraphs in this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments, with the exception of those passed over.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in view of the hour, I assume that the best thing we could do would be to recess until tomorrow noon.

GRAND CANYON PARK SOUTH APPROACH HIGHWAY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 109) to protect scenic values along the Grand Canyon Park South Approach Highway (State 64) within the Kaibab National Forest, Arizona, which were, on page 2, line 11, after "meridian," insert "and also those mining locations made under the mining laws of the United States on public-domain lands within those particular sections of townships 23 north, 24 north, 25 north, 26 north, 27 north, and 28 north, all in range 2 east, Gila and Salt River Base and meridian, through which there extends Arizona State Highway numbered 64 and a strip of land 1,000 feet wide on each side of the center line of the right-of-way thereof"; on page 2, line 23, after "land," insert "or rules and regulations issued by the Secretary of the Interior under this act with respect to public-domain lands under his jurisdiction,"; on page 3, line 4, after "regulations," insert "or rules and regulations of the Secretary of the Interior, as the case may be"; on page 3, line 6, strike out "national-forest" and insert "such"; on page 3, line 16, strike out "the national-forest" and insert "such"; on page 3, line 22, after "Agriculture," insert "or the Department of the In-

terior, respectively", and to amend the title so as to read: "An act to protect scenic values along the Grand Canyon Park Approach Highway (State 64) within the Kaibab National Forest, Arizona, and certain public-domain lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this bill, which was unanimously recommended by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is designed to protect scenic values along the Grand Canyon Park South Approach Highway (State 64) within the Kaibab National Forest, Arizona. The purpose of the bill was to allow the continuance of mining operations upon certain mining locations within the boundaries of the forest, but in such manner that surface operations should be carried on only under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture, in order not to detract from the scenic value.

The amendments adopted by the House include mining locations in areas not covered by the Senate bill. I have consulted both Senators from Arizona, and members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. There is no objection to the amendments of the House, and I therefore move that they be concurred in.

The motion was agreed to.

DEVELOPMENT STAGE OF THE A-BOMB BEFORE YALTA

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, a few days ago I made certain observations concerning the role of General Groves in the building of an atomic bomb. My statement was answered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who has found it necessary to proceed to Europe, where he will be joined by other members of the Foreign Relations Committee. In view of the state of the Record, I wish to read into the Record a letter which I addressed to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] under date of July 2, a letter which bears upon the remarks made by the Senator from Iowa on this subject. I read:

JULY 2, 1951.

DEAR SENATOR: I am indeed sorry that I was unable to be on the Senate floor last Saturday, June 30, when you discussed certain atomic energy security matters. However, I have the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD before me and note that it quotes you as saying this:

"Dr. Fuchs [the British wartime atomic spy] worked in the Manhattan project. However, General Groves and the Manhattan project not only had no responsibility for his security, but were forbidden by Executive order even to investigate him or other scientists who had been sent here by other countries. They were forced to accept the certificates of purity given by foreign countries. The FBI could not examine into them. It was a matter of 'Do not touch. You must not examine into the integrity or the background of foreign scientists who come here with certificates from their own governments to the effect that they are clean.' Fuchs and several others had certificates from the British Government stating that they had been investigated there and that they were clean and responsible. We were forbidden to go further. We could not even check on them."

Had I been present, I would have pointed out that General Groves has often stated in public and has testified to the Joint Commit-

tee on Atomic Energy that he personally had complete charge of security. To the very best of my knowledge—indeed, I am morally certain—there was never any Executive order forbidding General Groves to investigate members of the wartime British atomic energy mission. The general himself testified to the joint committee that he was the one who made the decision to accept the British certificate of Fuchs' loyalty at face value. Furthermore, General Groves testified that if he had the decision to make over again, he would not have accepted the British certificate of loyalty in Fuchs' case. Therefore, from the general's own testimony, it seems clear that there was no Executive order involved and that he was not "forced to accept the certificates of purity given by foreign countries."

Regarding the FBI, I understand that it sought to share in the responsibility for guarding atomic secrets during the war period and that General Groves insisted upon excluding the FBI. I am certain that if the general had permitted the FBI to help check upon all wartime project employees, that splendid organization would have been only too happy to assist in every way possible.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD also quotes you as saying this:

"I have in my possession a photograph, taken with a long-range telescopic camera at the Manhattan District while it was operating, of one of the most prominent persons working in the project, with a Russian espionage agent on one side and a member of the Russian consulate on the other. One of the Russians had in his pocket certain secret papers which this prominent person had transmitted to him. I have the photograph in my office. The Manhattan project was forbidden to prosecute this person. He was a traitor and spy, and they knew he was selling secrets. Yet, administratively higher authority prevented the Manhattan District from prosecuting him. A number of similar cases can be cited, if the facts ever come out."

I believe I know the identity of the individual in the picture to which you refer. If I am correct about his identity, he is the same individual as to whom the House Committee on Un-American Activities has indicated (during the 80th Cong.) that prosecution would be unjustified and ill-advised. However, it occurs to me that you may wish to give me, in confidence, the individual's name, so that I may cause a full report to be made to the Joint Committee.

The RECORD further quotes you as saying the following:

"They [the Russians] got advance information, and they got it during the Manhattan District days; and I may say to the Senator that, without doubt, they have been getting it since the Manhattan District days."

As you know the law which now governs atomic energy in the United States, and which I had the honor of sponsoring, vests responsibility for investigating the loyalty of atomic employees in the FBI. Thus I believe you will agree that a charge of successful Soviet espionage against our American project after the law was passed in mid-1946 and after the FBI entered the security picture is of serious concern not only to that organization but to the Atomic Energy Commission and the joint committee as well. I am sure that all three groups—the FBI, the AEC, and the committee—would be profoundly grateful if any such evidence in your possession could be made available to them. So far as I am aware, there is no known case of successful Soviet atomic espionage against the United States since the FBI replaced the wartime Manhattan District as the agency responsible for investigating project workers.

Possibly you had reference to the postwar security breaches known to have occurred

in Britain and Canada. If this is the case, I believe the record should show that these countries—and not the United States—are the ones whose security defenses are known to have been breached.

One final statement attributed to you in the RECORD gives me concern. It is this:

"Since that time [the Manhattan District days] we have been spending—depending on whose pencil we use and what kind of bookkeeping we employ, whether it is double-entry, triple-entry, quadruple-entry, or single-entry bookkeeping—we have been spending many billion dollars a year [for atomic energy]."

The official figures of both the Atomic Energy Commission and the General Accounting Office show that the AEC, from the time of its inception through the fiscal year which ended 2 days ago, has spent a total of less than \$2,700,000,000—never more than \$867,000,000 in any fiscal year and as little as \$479,000,000 in one fiscal year. Next fiscal year AEC is indeed expected to spend in excess of a billion—\$1,277,000,000 to be exact. However, this outlay will represent only about 2 cents in each dollar to be spent directly for military purposes. Likewise, ever since World War II ended, only about 2 cents in the total defense dollar has been devoted to atomic weapons; and this comparison excludes all spending for foreign economic aid.

As you know, I feel that we might well consider assigning a larger share of the defense dollar to atomic weapons than 2 cents; and I am fearful lest the American people be led to believe that our atomic effort is larger than has actually been the case.

I feel obligated to insert this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that my views may become known; but I will not make the letter public until you have opportunity to read it. Sincerely yours.

The letter is signed by me.

Mr. President, there are some 80,000 employees in the Atomic Energy Commission's activity. Nowhere near that number have access to secrets or classified information. In the case of every one of them having access to secret information, under the obligations of the law, the FBI investigation is full and complete. This is a precaution which, unfortunately, was not taken, as I have indicated, in the Manhattan District days. Despite the best efforts of the greatest investigative organization which exists in the world, it is possible, I suppose, that some foreign agent may penetrate the project. The important thing is that all the precautions I know of which can be written into law, and which can be applied administratively, have been used in order to prevent such things from happening. The day may come when it will be disclosed that there is someone in the Commission penetrating its secrets. It may be that he will be successful in penetrating them. But I am grateful that up to this moment, at least, no such case has been reported to us.

I say, again, Mr. President, that in contrast with the record of security as it was maintained in the Manhattan District days, it is a very, very satisfactory one. My description of the Manhattan District security a few days ago, as to its being almost like a cafeteria system, where persons marched in and got what they wanted seems to have been justified. Certainly Fuchs, May, Gold, Greenglass, and the other spies seemed to have had very little difficulty.

Of course, the penetration of the project by Fuchs, May, and others was a

very terrible thing to have happened. In the opinion of those best qualified to judge, the Soviet Government is today perhaps as much as 2 years ahead of where it would have been if it had been impossible for Russian agents to obtain the information concerning the project which they divulged to their masters in the Kremlin. The responsibility was directly upon the shoulders of General Groves. I state that without any bitterness, but as being merely a statement of fact, acknowledged by the General himself. Time and time again, he stated that he was in direct charge of security. When the Fuchs case arose, and he was requested to appear before the committee, he made that acknowledgement, as I indicated in my letter to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CASE: Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. CASE: The Senator's interest in atomic energy is well known. It was my understanding, based upon activities in connection with the House Committee on Un-American Activities, when we went into the subject of atomic espionage, also in connection with the matter of appropriations when I was a member of the subcommittee dealing with appropriations for the War Department, and also, later, when the Atomic Energy Commission was created, that General Groves was in charge of the project; that with respect to Fuchs, he had no opportunity to question his fitness to have access to the atomic energy plants and installations; that Fuchs was chosen by the State Department on credentials of the British Government, and that General Groves' hands were tied in the matter when it came to passing upon scientists who came as accredited representatives of the British Government.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator from South Dakota that I do not believe that version of the facts is a correct one. The agreement made at Quebec between President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill for cooperation in the atomic project contemplated the bringing together of leading scientists of Great Britain and employing them in our project, more particularly at Los Alamos. In some aspects of the matter the British at that time were ahead of our scientists. According to the testimony, which is available, they made a very great contribution in Los Alamos. However, it is a matter of record that the implementing of that agreement, as to how the scientists would be brought in, and who would be admitted, was in the hands of Gen. Leslie R. Groves. I will say to the Senator that I shall be glad to point out to him a portion of the record of General Groves' testimony in which he admitted that if he had had it to do over again he would have inquired and made investigation to find out on what the certificate of clearance on Fuchs was based. The State Department had no responsibility in the matter and no duty in the matter. It was General Groves, in charge of security, who issued the order to admit or debar the scientists to Manhattan District. It is the general's own testimony, in his own language, to which I refer.

tend over all the adjacent area in that part of the world, especially in Europe and among our Atlantic allies. I know that he is going to be in a position to continue rendering outstanding service in his new position, and I add my word of endorsement to the appointment.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Vice President laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of Mrs. L. Bortnik, of New York, N. Y., relating to price controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The petition of Mrs. Katherine E. Manzanara, of Long Beach, Calif., relating to overtime pay in the civil service, etc.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Petitions of former members of Philippine guerrilla forces submitting claims for compensation for services rendered the allied forces during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF PERSONNEL AND FUNDS BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following report was received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JULY 9, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS TO THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and

total salary of each person employed by its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1951, to June 30, 1951, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Anderson, Victor H., investigator, Jan. 1 to 31.....	\$7,022.16	\$585.18
Aultman, Bruce C., investigator, Jan. 1 to 15.....	6,153.14	256.38
Becker, Ralph E., assistant counsel, Feb. 16 to May 15.....	8,273.03	2,068.22
Broderick, William J., investigator, Jan. 5 to 31.....	6,153.14	444.39
Fried, Louis H., investigator, Jan. 4 to Mar. 31.....	6,153.14	1,487.00
Golden, Bill J., investigator, Jan. 15 to Apr. 15.....	6,153.14	1,555.37
Johnson, Grace E., clerk.....	7,022.16	3,511.08
McDermott, Edward A., counsel, Jan. 1 to May 15; May 25 to June 30.....	9,766.16	4,583.59
Rader, Le Roy A., counsel, Jan. 1 to 31.....	9,434.35	786.19
Reid, Olover F., investigator, Jan. 1 to Mar. 31.....	6,153.14	1,538.28
Sharfstein, Joseph, assistant counsel, Jan. 1 to Mar. 6.....	9,351.40	1,714.41
Melvin, Myrtle M., secretary-stenographer, Jan. 3 to Jan. 25.....	3,980.59	254.31

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure: Balance Jan. 1, 1951..... \$44,212.82
Amount expended: Salaries, \$18,784.40; expenses, \$7,307.61..... 26,092.01

Balance unexpended..... 18,120.81

G. M. GILLETTE,
Chairman.

CARL HAYDEN.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 6, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 109. An act to protect scenic values along the Grand Canyon Park Approach Highway (State 64) within the Kaibab National Forest, Ariz., and certain public-domain lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior;

S. 718. An act to authorize the lease and purchase by the United States of the Young Men's Christian Association Building and premises in Phoenix, Ariz.; and

S. 1042. An act to amend the act creating the Motor Carrier Claims Commission (Public Law 880, 80th Cong.).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEM:

S. 1804. A bill for the relief of Nadejda Nadia Van Leeuwen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 1805. A bill for the relief of Jerome M. Dunn; and

S. 1806. A bill for the relief of Stravroulu Lagou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1807 (by request). A bill to amend section 303 of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide for the crediting of certain service performed in the United States Military or Naval Academies by persons appointed as a cadet to the United States Military Academy prior to August 24, 1912, or as a midshipman in the Navy prior to March 3, 1913; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 1808. A bill to amend subsection (a) of section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to include claims of certain Ameri-

can citizens who served in the armed forces of any government allied with the United States during World War II and who were taken prisoner of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1809. A bill for the relief of Hristos M. Markas; and

S. 1810. A bill for the relief of Susie Ballard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIXON (for himself and Mr. McCARRAN):

S. 1811. A bill to suspend the running of the statutes of limitations applicable to offenses involving performance of official duties by Government officers and employees during periods of Government service of the officer or employee concerned; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 1812. A bill for the relief of Janice Justina King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1813. A bill to provide for the regulation of fares for the transportation of school children in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. HOLLAND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

BENEFITS UNDER WAR CLAIMS ACT TO CERTAIN AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which proposes to make eligible for benefits under the war claims fund, American citizens who served with our allies in World War II and were taken prisoners of war.

Under the present law, these citizens are not eligible, and the majority who fall within this category were in the service of the Canadian Armed Forces. As the law now stands, servicemen in the Armed Forces of the United States and civilians in either Government or private employment who were taken prisoners of war are eligible.

This bill to amend the War Claims Act requires no appropriations, inasmuch as funds for payment to prisoners of war are derived from sale of assets of alien enemies, which assets were seized by the Alien Property Custodian.

In most cases American citizens who entered military service of an ally did so prior to our entry into World War II. Most of those in allied service were able to transfer into the American service. However, there are a small number of cases where American citizens were taken prisoner before there was an opportunity to transfer to the American Armed Forces.

The bill (S. 1808) to amend subsection (a) of section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to include claims of certain American citizens who served in the armed forces of any Government allied with the United States during World War II and who were taken prisoner of war, introduced by Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER INTERESTS

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, the battle over economic controls has high lighted once again a major defect in our legislative structure: there does not exist any effective agency in the Congress through which the consumer's voice can be specifically heard.

The interests of all producer groups, financial groups, agricultural groups, distributor groups, big and small business, and labor organizations are fully represented through particular congressional committees. Yet there is no congressional body specifically dealing with consumer interests, though all our citizens are consumers.

Congress often forgets that farmers are consumers as well as producers. The prices farmers have to pay for all the consumers' goods which they need in order to live and to operate their farms are one of the two essentials in determining whether they can make ends meet—the other essential, of course, being the prices they receive for their farm produce. Congress often ignores the fact that the consumer's interest is exactly equal to the producer's interest and, in fact, is the other side of the same economic coin. Millions of housewives are appalled by the seemingly unending rise of the cost of living. Millions of our older citizens dependent on pensions or small fixed incomes, veterans living on pensions and families of men in the armed services, the great mass of unorganized workers and lower-bracket salaried employees—probably the majority of our citizens—are being squeezed between low incomes and high prices. As consumers, these millions of people, as well as everybody else, are entitled to adequate protection by the Congress. They cannot today secure such protection because there is no congressional committee dedicated to that purpose. The aim of the sponsors of a resolution I am about to submit is to remedy this basic defect as soon as possible.

On behalf of myself, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], I submit for appropriate reference a resolution provid-

ing for the creation of a select committee to be known as the Committee on Consumer Interests, to consist of 13 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I advise the Senator from Iowa that since receiving his invitation to join in sponsoring the resolution I have been unable to see him until this moment. I am very proud to accept his invitation to join in sponsoring the resolution.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and the sawdust trail is still open.

The resolution (S. Res. 169), submitted by Mr. GILLETTE (for himself and other Senators), was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be known as the Committee on Consumer Interests and to consist of 13 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate as soon as practicable after the date of adoption of this resolution.

It shall be the duty of such committee to study and survey by means of research and investigation all problems affecting consumer interests in the present national emergency and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation, and to report to the Senate from time to time the results of such studies and surveys, together with its recommendations. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee and such committee shall not have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

In carrying out its duties the committee shall give special attention to prices charged the consumer for food, fuel, and clothing and the costs and methods of producing, processing, and distributing these and other consumer goods.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the Eighty-second Congress at such times and places, whether or not the Senate is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to borrow from Government departments and agencies such special assistants, and to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee thereof, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

Graduation exercises address delivered by Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, at the University of Hawaii, and tribute paid to him in connection with the award of honorary degree of doctor of laws.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

Memorial Day address by Herve J. L'Heureux at Freeport, Long Island, N. Y., May 30, 1951.

By Mr. FREAR:

Editorial entitled "Complacency at the Pentagon," from the Washington Evening Star for July 6, 1951, and an article entitled "Tungsten Blunders," from the Washington Daily News for July 6, 1951, dealing with the work of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Table showing the share of Illinois, by counties, in the Federal public debt and assessed valuation of real and personal property.

Article entitled "Is Democracy New to the Slovaks?" written by Blaise Hospodar and published in Slovak Amerika.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Letter from Roy V. Peel, Director of the Census, enclosing data on rent-income ratios for nonfarm dwelling units.

Editorial published in the Christian Science Monitor, as reprinted in the Jackson County (Ala.) Sentinel, and editorial in the Florence (Ala.) Times, both with reference to appeasement.

Editorials published in the New York Times of July 3, 1951 and in the Washington Daily News of July 5, 1951, with reference to the defense program.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, when the pending bill was acted on by the House I addressed a letter to the distinguished chairman of the Senate subcommittee handling House bill 3790. At the time I wrote this letter I was deeply concerned over the cuts which the House had made in certain of the items in this bill, especially those for the construction of transmission lines. I was also concerned over the Keating amendment. The committee has, I understand, modified this amendment, but I am still not completely satisfied with it.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter referred to printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,

Washington, D. C., June 4, 1951.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Interior Department,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: The subcommittee of which you are chairman is considering the appropriation bill for the Interior Department. I am extremely interested in several major aspects of that bill, including espe-

cially some of the changes made by the House.

Although my State is not directly affected, except by one of the changes made, I feel very strongly, as a member of the Interior committee, against the entire tendency of the House-approved amendments—especially the Keating amendment—to strike down the authority of the Federal Government to build transmission lines in the areas where they are needed.

As one who has long been associated with the study and advocacy of hydroelectric power development in the public interest, I feel that the actions taken by the House were most unwise and could prove disastrous. I trust that your committee will reverse the actions taken by the House.

I refer above all, as I have said, to the Keating amendment which prohibits construction of transmission facilities in areas covered by power wheeling service contracts. This provision, if retained, would mark a complete reversal of our public power policy which has done so much to bring low-cost water power to the homes and industries of America. In a time as critical as the present one, when the fate of this Nation and of the entire free world depends upon the growing productive capacity of America, a move such as the one referred to would be foolhardy and crippling to the defense effort.

Many of the cuts in specific appropriations, especially those for construction of new transmission lines and short extensions of present lines, also impress me as being most unwise and self-defeating, accomplishing no real economy, but wasting our most precious national resource, water power. This comment applies especially to the cut in the Bonneville power item, but also applies to the cuts in the Southeastern Power Administration and the Southwestern Power Administration.

One further item deleted without real justification, in my judgment, was the \$35,000 requested for Interior Department participation in the New York-New England power resources survey. This item was eliminated, without prejudice, but on the basis that no legal authority for this expenditure existed. I would suggest that there is authority for such a survey under the terms of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944. A similar survey, under the same authority, was carried on in the Red River Valley in the Southwest.

I have strongly advocated this survey in the New York-New England area; I think the findings from such a survey can be of the greatest usefulness in the consideration of plans for the development of water resources in that entire area. I hope the Senate committee will see its way clear to restoring this item.

I hope you will find it possible to give such consideration to these views as you think are justified. I would be gratified if my views could be laid before the committee and made part of the record.

With kind personal regards.

Very sincerely yours,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if there be no further routine business, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator suspend for a moment? The Chair was about to call attention to the fact that the amendments passed over yesterday, unless the Senator wishes it otherwise, will be taken up in the order in which they appear in the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think that will probably be the best way to proceed. In case there are Senators who ask for further continuance of amendments, we can consider such requests at the time they are made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

The Senator from Arizona has suggested the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECORD OF THE EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS TO DATE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, this is the beginning of a new governmental year. Fiscal year 1951 just ended and the Senate has been in session just 6 months. It is a time to take stock; to review what we have done and what we must do in the days ahead.

I think it is particularly important that we do this since we have just celebrated once again the signing of the Declaration of Independence by the First Continental Congress in 1776. When we review our record, we will find that our traditional method of carrying on our business is the finest and most responsive in the world.

Mr. President, the United States is the most productive, the most energetic, and in all respects the strongest nation our earth has ever seen.

What makes it that?

Is it our millions of fertile acres producing greater amounts of food and fibers than people ever conceived possible?

Is it the tremendous resources of oil and gas and coal which power our gigantic industry?

Is it our thousands of square miles of timber?

Is it our industrial empire, greater and more productive than that of all the rest of the world combined?

Is it our modern communications systems linking together almost instantaneously all our people?

Ah, yes, Mr. President, all of these contribute to our strength. But they are as nothing; they are sterile, inanimate things without one factor—the real reason for our greatness. The strength of America, Mr. President, is our freedom; the freedom of our people, from the humblest to the mightiest to say what they think; to be free to criticize their Government and their leaders; to insist and demand that they be heard and heeded. That, Mr. President, is America's greatest strength.

The people of this Nation, Mr. President, have come through trying times in the last quarter century. They have lived through two awful wars, taking thousands of their loved ones from them. They sacrificed lives and property for an ideal—to make freedom more secure in the world. A year ago they responded as with a single voice in a similar threat against a poor, downtrodden, scarcely known people thousands of miles away. Again their sons and daughters shed blood there while their parents poured out their substance to support that sanguinary war, and to help make other nations stronger and

more determined to resist further threats of aggression.

Is it to be wondered that this has become known as the age of anxiety? Our people are disturbed, wondering, questioning. They have been demanding facts; they have been exercising the power that has made America strong.

How has the Congress responded? Well, let us look at the record. The problems confronting the Congress today demanded time-consuming committee hearings and prolonged debate on this floor on many momentous issues.

Long before the Congress assembled in January, the people had before them the proposition that conditions in the world demanded once again not only the reimpementation of selective service but the establishment of a longer-range system of universal military training. To European countries, to peoples reared in a tradition of militarism, such a proposal was commonplace; as expected as death and taxes.

But, Mr. President, to us—to our people—this was a momentous step; an action pregnant with a thousand dreaded possibilities. We are a people which has been taught to shun militarism. The founding fathers abjured standing armies; they feared the rise of a military caste. The millions of immigrants who came here in the century that followed were running away from enforced military service; they taught their children to hate it.

Is it any wonder that we were facing an issue that required the fullest and most thorough exposition? Is it any wonder that our people demanded that they be shown the need for this unprecedented step—a step that had been resisted from the day George Washington himself urged that the young Republic's men all receive some military training.

These studies began last September. The hearings consumed seven solid weeks in the Senate alone; testimony was taken from scores of witnesses—educators, churchmen, leading citizens from every walk of life, in addition to the military men. Then followed 10 days of debate on the Senate floor. Surely, everyone will agree that the 2 months spent in consideration of so momentous and far-reaching a new policy was in the best interests of our people. For the first time in 175 years of the Republic's history we had set into motion the machinery to establish a universal military training program; a commission of eminent citizens has been appointed and confirmed by the Senate to establish the machinery. The Nation has been set on a new path and it was done only because through the legislative process the people had their chance to approve the program.

What came next? Was it some routine, run-of-the-mine legislative proposal? Oh, no, Mr. President. Within a few days after we had assembled, we had thrust upon us the question of sending American soldiers to a foreign land in peacetime. Was it wrong to raise this question? Was it wasting time to debate this proposition?

Mr. President, let us remember that here again we were taking, for us, a new and wholly unprecedented step in foreign policy. The people were concerned;

their sons were to be sent to foreign lands to stand guard at faraway ramparts in defense of the homeland. Some found it difficult to understand the underlying facts, the necessity for such action. People were puzzled, angry, even fearful of what such a policy meant to the future of their country. They had a right to know the facts, and we had a duty to explore and lay bare for them what necessitated such a policy.

So, for one solid month through February, 26 Members of this body sat in the joint sessions of the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees and threshed out the pros and cons. Then came two additional weeks of debate and explanation on this floor. The 6 weeks of careful and searching exploration of this proposed new policy was essential that the people and the Congress would know the facts.

Then, with that question hardly out of the way, we were face to face with another, perhaps less vital and less far-reaching, but far more strident and passionate. I refer, of course, to what history will probably term the MacArthur incident.

Involved here, whether properly or not, was the entire issue of the Nation's far-eastern foreign policy. A brilliant military leader had dramatically challenged basic policy decisions, and by that act had brought to a head the fundamental concept of whether the military or the civil arm is supreme. In the excitement of the moment, millions of our citizens, most of our organs of public opinion, and a substantial majority of our legislative establishment, all normally calm and purposeful, suddenly began to shout and scream and insist that the Nation hear at first hand from the lips of the general, and from all others concerned, the sworn facts. Quiet reasoning and prudent counsel was brushed aside; hysteria replaced sanity for a while, and forthwith there began one of the longest, most searching, and most complex legislative hearings in our entire history.

For eight solid weeks it went on; testimony under oath was taken from 13 key witnesses and more than 2,000,000 words were recorded. If the people of our country were split over the MacArthur incident, surely it was essential that an investigation be conducted in such a way as to convince us that all the facts were laid on the record. With all of their disadvantages the hearings have served the best interest of the country; they have produced a measure of unity which otherwise might have been unattainable. While leaders in other lands may be perplexed as to why such an investigation was desirable, those who know our own history and our way of doing things understand fully that the hearings have brought about just what the joint committee has said—the American people are “unshaken in our determination to defend ourselves and to cooperate to the limit of our capabilities with all of those free nations determined to survive in freedom.”

What did those hearings mean to Congress, particularly to the Senate? From April 11, the date of General Mac-

Arthur's dismissal, to 10 days ago the issue has been uppermost in the minds and in the actual day-by-day activities of the overwhelming majority of the Senate. While technically only the 26 members of the two committees were directly involved in the 2 months of hearings themselves, actually from one-third to one-half of our membership participated directly in the hearings and in the debates that flared up and accompanied the hearings from time to time. Members of Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees are also key members of at least six other major Senate committees, each of which was supposed to be considering important legislation.

Understandably the legislative process lagged under the demands of this hearing and the attendant foreign policy questions. The hearings themselves ran morning, afternoon, and even night. To conduct them properly, to ask intelligent questions, required painstaking preparation and long hours of study on the part of all members of the committees.

Our distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], whose fairness and competency have won him the admiration of all of us, worked 14, 15, and even 16 hours a day on the job, Saturdays, Sundays, and weekdays, for more than 2 months. I am sure that there were many others on both sides of the aisle who followed an equally arduous schedule.

None of these men would have it otherwise. More important, the people, who had been stirred and disturbed, would not have it otherwise. The very publications which today chide us for being behind in our normal legislative schedule, were themselves the loudest in insisting on full hearings, thorough hearings, complete hearings. I can even remember some arguing that all other business be laid aside since this, they asserted, was the most important issue in a century, and should be fully gone into by every Member of the Senate.

Bearing in mind that some 3 months was actually lifted out of the normal legislative calendar, let us consider what we have accomplished in spite of these delaying factors.

The Senate itself has considered and passed some 485 bills, 70 of which have thus far become public law, following action by the House of Representatives. Most of these are not the kind of bills that we read a great deal about in the newspapers, but they are nevertheless of great importance to thousands of people in every State in the Union. The humdrum, day-by-day routine of getting our work done does not get into the headlines; in fact, more often than not the headlines and the flash radio reports about Congress are not nearly so important as the daily grind—10, 12, and 14 hours a day in committee and on the floor, sifting the wheat from the chaff.

Consider what we have done in the way of passage of what may be termed major legislation—nationally important bills and resolutions. The list, by any standard, is imposing. Let me recite it:

First. The bill extending selective service and setting up machinery for a

permanent universal military training program.

Second. The resolution approving the sending of four American divisions to Europe.

Third. The resolution declaring that Communist China should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations.

Fourth. The resolution calling on the United Nations to brand Red China as an aggressor in Korea.

Fifth. The resolution expressing the American people's friendship for all the peoples of the world.

Sixth. The resolution calling on the United Nations to take action to bring about an embargo on the shipment of war materials to Communist China.

Seventh. The bill extending the important Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Eighth. The bill authorizing construction of 140 new naval vessels, including a super aircraft-carrier.

Ninth. The bill providing for a long-term loan to India to provide 2,000,000 tons of grain for its starving people.

Tenth. The bill granting the President authority to control exports, to conserve scarce materials.

Eleventh. Two bills of great interest to soldiers and veterans which grant free life insurance to those in the Armed Forces, and provide hospitalization for Korean veterans.

Twelfth. The approval of the reorganization of the RFC, thus maintaining it as an important lending agency for small American businesses anxious to contribute to the defense effort.

Thirteenth. The bill establishing new procedures for renegotiation of defense contracts, so as to prevent exorbitant profits.

Fourteenth. Nine appropriation bills, seven of which were for essential supplemental items and two of the regular annual bills. Since it was necessary last week to adopt a temporary continuing resolution for appropriations for a number of agencies, I think it should be pointed out, Mr. President, there is nothing new or novel about such action; that this not the first time that a Congress has found it necessary to take such action. In fact, since 1948, 10 such continuing resolutions have been passed; and there were others before then, but on previous occasions there were few of the compelling factors that brought about the delay encountered this year. Let me remind you that appropriation bills originate in the House of Representatives; that this year they were delayed more than a month there until a final decision was reached to abandon the single-package appropriation bill of last year and return to the separate bills of former years. Our own Appropriations Committee is now considering, and will have ready for action very shortly, the five additional bills already passed by the House, one of which is now before the Senate for consideration.

Fifteenth. The bill extending the Defense Production Act. Here, again, we were up against a deadline; and long sessions were necessary to meet the expiration date of the existing act. For the

formity required by the law, there is quoted a pertinent paragraph:

"Every public utility doing business within the District of Columbia is required to furnish service and facilities reasonably safe and adequate and in all respects just and reasonable. The charge made by any such public utility for any facility or services furnished, or rendered or to be furnished or rendered, shall be reasonable, just, and non-discriminatory. Every unjust or unreasonable or discriminatory charge for such facility or service is prohibited and is hereby declared unlawful. Every public utility is hereby required to obey the lawful orders of the commission created by chapters 1-10 of this title." (Title 43, ch. 3, sec. 301, D. C. Code, 1940 ed.).

MORE LIGHT ON SCHOOL FARES

Putting aside the discussion of this question from a largely academic viewpoint, and dealing instead with facts and figures, is more illuminating and may suggest a practical solution.

During the calendar year 1949 the Capital Transit Co. collected 8,989,243 3-cent fares from school riders. This represented a money value of \$269,677.26. The average full-price fare at this time is over 13 cents per passenger. This indicates an estimated loss on each school fare of about 10 cents, or, using the 1949 figures, a total of nearly \$899,000. The Star editorial and other editorials on the subject have referred to the special school rate of fare as a subsidy borne by other riders through the imposition of a higher rate.

Viewing this matter another way, it appears that this subsidy of nearly \$899,000 represents an added cost to the transit company.

The special-school-rate law was enacted by Congress in 1931 in response to a popular demand crystallized in a vigorous and well-publicized campaign. It was then apparent that a substantial portion of the community favored a special low-rate fare for the children going to and from school. A very natural question arises as to who should subsidize these riding school children, and it has never been considered and decided as to whether the burden should fall upon the community or the transit company.

If this is a clearly defined community obligation and is to be handled by the transit company for the community, there should be adequate compensation for the company's heavy loss of revenue.

If the Capital Transit Co. is considered to be entitled to reimbursement, the next problem to be confronted is to find the most feasible method. To cover such an amount by an appropriation from the Public Treasury would beyond a doubt be most unpopular among citizens' groups and in Congress. A more simple and painless plan might be for Congress, by appropriate legislation, to authorize an equivalent credit against the heavy District taxes imposed annually on the Capital Transit Co.

These taxes include 3 percent on gross street-railway receipts, 8 mills per mile on bus operation, motor-vehicle license taxes, gasoline tax, real-estate taxes, unemployment-compensation taxes, District income tax, and other miscellaneous District of Columbia taxes. These District taxes alone aggregated during the year 1949 more than \$1,300,000. A credit of more than \$800,000 would make a substantial reduction in the amount of District taxes paid annually by the company and might figure conspicuously in determining fares and return.

There is an apparent reluctance on the part of the Capital Transit Co. and the PUC to inaugurate and actively urge remedial legislation to remove the inequity of the 3-cent rate for children going to and from school.

Section 408 of the public-utilities law appears definitely to authorize the PUC to investigate in any respect unreasonable or unjustly discriminatory rates. But the posi-

tive requirement for a 3-cent school fare would prevent the Commission from granting any kind of relief. However, under section 411, "if upon such investigation the rates, tolls, charges, schedules, or joint rates shall be found to be unjust, unreasonable, insufficient, or unjustly discriminatory, or to be preferential or otherwise in violation of any of the provisions of chapters 1-10 of this title," normally under such a situation it would be handled by the Commission. In absence of the necessary authority because of the school-fare law there is nothing to prevent the matter being urgently brought to the attention of Congress for remedial legislation. Under section 417, an opening appears for the company to make a complaint to the Commission and urge that it officially seek a cure for this gross inequity through proper legislation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Without wearying the Senate by quoting the article in full, I wish to read two paragraphs. The first is a quotation by Mr. Suter from a Star editorial which had appeared earlier, in the issue of June 29, 1950, and which I read, as follows:

The Commission's critical comments on the 3-cent fare for school children are well justified. The concession to school children, it pointed out, puts an unfair burden on all other passengers. But the PUC can do nothing to correct this inequity. The 3-cent fare was fixed by Congress in 1933—at a time when the regular fare was 7½ cents. It has not been increased since, despite the higher cost of providing this transportation. If school children are to have a special rate, the subsidy should not be borne by the company or by its patrons. It should be borne by the public at large, through a governmental subsidy.

The other paragraph which I wish to read is the conclusion of the writer of the article, Mr. Suter, in which he shows rather clearly the contrast between the provisions now affecting rates charged school children in the District and the other provisions of law applicable to public utilities and the fixation of rates in general. I quote:

The law creating the present Public Utilities Commission clothes that body with broad powers minutely described as to valuations of properties of public-utility companies used and useful in the operation of their business. Upon determining such valuation the Commission is charged with the responsibility of fixing rates for services which will yield a fair return on the valuation officially established. The enactment by Congress of the 3-cent school fare, under the acts of 1931 and 1933, is a direct contravention of the general powers of the Commission under the law.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize the last statement by reading it again:

The enactment by Congress of the 3-cent school fare, under the acts of 1931 and 1933, is a direct contravention of the general powers of the Commission under the law.

Mr. President, in the effort to get at the facts, I have gone into this matter in detail with the Public Utilities Commission and the Capital Transit Co., and also to some extent with the school authorities of the District. I have likewise discussed it with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], ranking majority member of the committee, and the distinguished chairman of the House Commit-

tee on the District of Columbia, Mr. McMILLAN, of South Carolina, all of whom seem to feel that it is highly appropriate at this time to consider legislation on this matter.

Further, it seems to me particularly necessary for the Congress to go into this subject at this time in view of the recent strike, the resulting substantial increase of operating costs, and the general opinion that the whole rate structure of the Capital Transit Co. must be carefully reexamined. The rates charged in other cities, according to the information furnished me by the Library of Congress, a copy of which I have already inserted as part of my remarks, clearly show that the rates for school children in the District of Columbia are considerably lower than the rates charged in other American cities comparable in size to Washington.

In asking for the reference of this bill to the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, I express the strong hope that early and thorough hearings may be held to the end that this legislation, either as submitted or in such form as may be indicated by the hearings to be most wise and equitable, may be passed at an early date so that any general early rate revision which may be required may include a study and revision of the rates for school children.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). The clerk will state the first committee amendment passed over.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 5, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph under the titled "Construction, Southeastern Power Administration."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask that this amendment and the other amendments be passed over, except an amendment which the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] desires to offer, because Senators have stated to me that they desire to vote on the amendments on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, line 8, it is proposed to delete the numerals "\$41,180,000" and insert the numerals "\$41,324,750."

On page 12, line 9, it is proposed to delete the numerals "\$23,699,661" and insert the numerals "\$23,751,661."

Mr. WATKINS. The purpose of the amendment—

Mr. HAYDEN. The amount in line 9 need not be changed, because the amount is based upon the budget estimate. The only item which the Senate needs to change is in line 8.

Mr. WATKINS. The other figure need not be changed?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; because all limitations on personal services are based upon a 10 percent reduction in administrative personnel, as set forth in the budget estimates.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I will accept the modification of my amendment. Therefore, it will go only to line 8, on page 12.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. How much would the amendment add to the bill?

Mr. WATKINS. \$144,750. It is for the purpose of operating the Intermountain Indian School at Brigham City, Utah, to the full capacity of 2,150 pupils. At the time the budget was prepared it was thought that the school could take care of only 2,000 pupils. The amount of \$144,750 would take care of the additional students. The general overhead for heat and light would be the same, with some minor exceptions. It is for the general operation of the plant, which was originally an Army hospital. It has been turned over to the Indian Bureau.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator advise the Senate why the amount was not included in the budget estimates?

Mr. WATKINS. At the time the budget was made up, the improvements had not been completed, so it was not possible to take care of the full capacity of 2,150 students. It was thought that only 2,000 could be taken care of.

Mr. FERGUSON. From time to time the committee receives supplemental budget estimates, and I do not recall any supplemental estimates on this item.

Mr. HAYDEN. There was no supplemental budget estimate. The Senator from Utah appeared at the hearings and explained to the committee that it was not realized by the Bureau of the Budget at the time the budget estimates were prepared that the number of students could be increased without increasing the overhead. The Senator is aware of the fact that there are more than 5,000 Navajo Indian children who cannot speak the English language. This is a determined effort to try to enroll them in school and teach them to speak our language, and thus enable them to get about in the world.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is this one of the schools at which children are boarded during the term of school?

Mr. HAYDEN. The facility formerly housed an Army hospital. It was turned over to the Indian Bureau in order to establish a school. It is not very far from the Navajo country in southern Utah.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no compulsory education of Navajo Indian children, is there?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is impossible to have compulsory education in this case because there are no schools to put them in.

Mr. FERGUSON. Where school facilities are provided there is no compulsory education, as I understand. When

I spent some time in the Navajo country, I found that students would stay in school 1 day, perhaps, and then go back home. In other words, there is no compulsory educational program provided, and the parents are under no obligation to send their children to school. Is that correct?

Mr. WATKINS. Conditions in the Navajo reservation in the last few years have changed. The Navajo parents themselves now desire educational opportunities for their children. When the busses, which take the Indian children to school, called at the collecting stations during the first year, even though the children had not had an opportunity to see what the school was like, several hundred more Indian children collected at the stations than it was possible to take care of.

Last year the superintendent of schools told me that at Shiprock alone some 300 Indian students, in addition to those that had been designated to go to school, were at the bus station ready to go to school. They have had no difficulty in keeping the children in school. They want to go to school. Instead of the 5,000 children to whom the Senator from Arizona has called attention as being without facilities for education, there are more than 12,000 students on the Navajo Reservation who should be in school. We have not provided the facilities, notwithstanding that 80 years ago we entered into a solemn treaty with the Indians to furnish them with 1 schoolroom and a teacher for every 30 pupils. We have never kept the obligation. This is an attempt to train the children so that they can take their place in modern society. We shall have to move at least half of the Navajos from the reservation because the resources will not take care of more than 30,000 Indians, and they have increased to more than 60,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, let me ask at what age the Indians are taken into the school.

Mr. WATKINS. They have been taken in between the ages of 12 and 16. I visited the Indian school last fall, and they have one of the finest groups of young people I have seen in any school in the country, whether for white children, red children, or black children.

I understand that the English language is being taught in the school, because, contrary to what the Senator from Arizona said, nearly 80 percent of the Navajos, including the men, women, and children, cannot speak English. That is a big handicap, so the first job at the school is to teach the children the English language.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have always been in favor of freedom for the Indians. I think we have a typical example of communism in America insofar as the Indians are concerned, for they are the wards of the state. We take care of them to the nth degree.

However, because of the parliamentary situation with which we are confronted today, I request the Senator from Utah to agree that a vote on this amendment be withheld until Monday,

when votes will be taken on the other amendments.

Mr. WATKINS. In view of the small size of the appropriation called for by the amendment, and in view of the fact that the United States is already bound by contract to provide these children with an education, and the school is there, I thought there would be no hesitancy on the part of the committee in accepting the amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course the committee considered the amendment, but it was not allowed, insofar as this particular amount was concerned.

Mr. WATKINS. Did the committee consider this particular amount and amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator had an amendment before the committee.

Mr. WATKINS. Yes; but I do not believe the committee considered it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I find in the committee hearings a statement by the Senator from Utah, from which I read the following:

I urge that this committee increase the appropriation for operating the Intermountain Indian School at Brigham City, Utah, by \$144,750 during fiscal 1952 so that this school may be operated to capacity.

Although the committee did not vote to add that amount to the bill, naturally the committee considered the request, but did not allow it, as I think the chairman of the committee will agree.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think the Senator from Utah is correct. The matter was not brought to the attention of the committee, and there was no vote on it.

The only record we had on it was the record made by the Senator from Utah at the time when his statement was presented. However, when the committee came to mark up the bill, this matter was not mentioned.

Mr. WATKINS. That is why I want to have the amendment accepted by the committee. Under the contract, we have the obligation of providing the Indians with an education; but now 12,000 of them have no opportunity to attend school, and previously 16,000 of them were without an opportunity to attend school.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that situation and the importance of the problems of the Indians in the Senator's State and in other States. However, I think the amendment should be passed over until Monday, when we may have a vote on it.

Mr. WATKINS. I am willing to have that done. What I want is to have the Indians treated properly, and I desire this amendment presented fairly. I wish to have a vote taken on the merits of the amendment. When the merits of the amendment are understood, I am certain that no Senator will wish to vote against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment submitted by the Senator from Utah will be passed over.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement which I have prepared in support of the amendment I have just proposed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS

I have sent to the desk an amendment to H. R. 3790.

The purpose of this amendment is to make it possible to use to the full capacity the Intermountain Indian School at Brigham City, Utah. This Indian school was formerly a military hospital known as Bushnell, which was built for the Army during World War 2 at a cost between ten and fourteen million dollars. The exact cost of this plant I have never been able to learn.

At the conclusion of the war the Army abandoned it as a military hospital. Despite repeated efforts on my part to have the Army or the Veterans' Administration use this hospital for the original purpose for which it was constructed, the Army and the Veterans' Administration persisted in their refusal.

When I found that it was impossible to get these Departments to continue the plant as a hospital, I proposed to the Congress that it be transferred to the Indian Bureau for the purpose of establishing an Indian school principally for the education of the Navajo and Hopi Indians. Congress enacted the necessary legislation and also approved an amendment I submitted to the appropriation bill, appropriating \$3,750,000 for the purpose of remodeling the hospital quarters for dormitory service and 54 additional classrooms, a gymnasium, and an auditorium.

The Indian school has been in operation now for a year and a half. When the budget was prepared for the Indian Bureau for fiscal 1952, the plant had not been quite completed to permit its use in full capacity. But by next September 1st it will be 100 percent completed so it will be possible to house and train 2,150 pupils instead of 2,000 that were provided for in the budget which was submitted to the Congress.

The use of the plant to its full capacity will require an additional \$144,750. This is the cost for 150 extra pupils at an average cost of \$965. This covers their board and room, some clothing, and incidentals. Certainly the plant should be used to its full capacity.

May I remind the Senate at this time that some 80 years ago the United States entered into a treaty with the Navajo and Hopi Indians in which it was agreed that the United States would provide education for the Indian children, specific provisions being for 1 classroom and a teacher for each 30 children of school age. The United States has utterly failed to keep its part of the agreement. Even with the Intermountain Indian School operating at full capacity there will be more than 12,000 children of school age on the Navajo reservation for

which there are absolutely no educational facilities. That means that that many children will become adults without any training whatever to help them care for themselves in a modern world.

It has been repeated here many times, and should be reemphasized, that the Indian population is now more than 60,000 and at least one-half of this number will have to be finally relocated elsewhere in order to make a living. The known resources on the reservation will not take care of more than 30,000 Indians.

I regret very much that the President did not budget the full amount of the rehabilitation program for the Navajo and Hopi Indians. The budget was cut some \$4,000,000 under what it should have been in order to keep up with the rehabilitation program authorized by Congress a year ago.

At one time it was difficult to get the Indian children to attend school, but that time has long since passed. Contact with the world which Navajo youth had during World War II has changed the thinking of the Navajo people. They now seek an education. In fact, they are clamoring for it. When the busses called at the collection centers last September to transport Navajo children to Brigham City to attend the school, they found 300 more children than could be accommodated at the school ready for the trip to Brigham City. The extra 300 children and their parents knew about the limit to the school's capacity and knew they had not been included, but nevertheless they came to the collection stations with the hope that there might be some vacancies or some last minute possibility of going to the school.

It seems to me that this great Nation which is taking on so many obligations to develop the undeveloped areas and peoples of the earth should not fail and neglect to keep its solemn agreements with the American Indians who were by force required to give up lands which their tribes had occupied for centuries. We wrote the treaties ourselves and we certainly ought to keep them.

By the adoption of this amendment at least 150 more Navajo children who are anxious to go to school and praying for that opportunity will be taken care of. The general overhead will not be increased. The cost of heating plant, lighting system, and general supervision will be the same whether they are there or not. In this time of inflated prices the figure of \$965 yearly cost per pupil is not extravagant in the least. I consider it a very modest cost and there should not be the slightest hesitancy in adding this sum to the budget or to the appropriation for education with a definite understanding that it will be used to permit the Intermountain Indian School to operate to full capacity.

The proposals in this appropriation bill for Indian education are well below the budget estimate. I urge this amendment be accepted by the Committee, and if not, that it be approved by the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk seven amendments to the pending bill, which I ask to have printed and lie on the table, and to be called up on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1952—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I submit amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The explanatory statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR DOUGLAS ON HIS AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 3790, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. President, the nine amendments I am submitting, if adopted, would result in savings of \$23,871,000 below the amounts recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee and savings of \$39,235,300 below the budget estimates.

The largest of these is the amendment to reduce funds for construction and rehabilitation in the Bureau of Reclamation. Going over these projects, I have found that by cutting money for plans and investigations and slowing up construction on irrigation projects we can save \$16,083,000 below the committee recommendations and \$27,126,000 below the budget. The affect of these cuts on power facilities needed for defense would thus be negligible. This can be demonstrated in the project break-down of my amendment shown below.

Also shown in a table below are the effects of my other eight amendments. As indicated in the table these cuts primarily affect funds for management, studies, investigations, construction, maintenance, and administrative overhead. These items represent points which, in my judgment, should be reduced during a period of rising defense expenditures.

Proposed Douglas amendments to H. R. 3790, Interior appropriations bill

Agency	Purpose	Budget	Senate committee	Douglas amendment	Douglas amendment below—	
					Budget	Senate committee
National Park Service.....	Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities.....	\$7,396,500	\$7,369,790	\$6,500,000	\$896,500	\$869,790
Do.....	Construction.....	11,975,000	11,370,000	10,370,000	1,605,000	1,000,000
Fish and Wildlife Service.....	Management of resources.....	6,870,000	6,606,558	6,000,000	870,000	606,558
Do.....	Investigation of resources.....	4,046,000	3,858,986	3,500,000	546,000	358,986
Geological Survey.....		22,900,000	21,300,000	20,000,000	2,900,000	1,300,000
Bureau of Reclamation.....	General investigation.....	5,500,000	4,600,000	3,000,000	2,500,000	1,600,000
Do.....	Operation and maintenance.....	16,385,000	16,168,594	15,094,000	1,291,000	1,074,594
Do.....	General administrative expenses.....	6,000,000	5,478,203	4,500,000	1,500,000	978,000
Do.....	Construction and rehabilitation.....	223,690,000	208,344,450	192,261,450	27,126,800	16,083,000
Total savings.....					39,235,300	23,871,000

Project breakdown of Douglas amendment to construction and rehabilitation figure of the Bureau of Reclamation

Project	Budget	House	Senate committee	Douglas amendment	Saving below budget	Saving below Senate committee	Remarks
All-American Canal, Ariz.-Calif.....	\$180,000	\$1,772,330	\$2,963,000	\$180,000		\$2,783,000	Hold to budget.
Cachuma, Calif.....	11,150,000	9,508,180	10,000,000	9,000,000	\$2,150,000	1,000,000	Slow down construction.
Central Valley project, California.....	38,750,000	32,204,210	33,870,000	31,170,000	7,580,000	2,700,000	Do.
Columbia Basin project, Washington.....	27,900,000	25,672,090	27,000,000	24,400,000	3,500,000	2,600,000	Do.
Missouri River Basin:							
Phase A.....	46,056,600	38,507,950	40,499,800	36,499,800	9,556,800	4,000,000	Do.
Phase B.....	3,525,000	2,852,450	3,185,000	1,685,000	1,840,000	1,500,000	Slow-down planning.
Phase C.....	3,500,000	2,852,450	3,000,000	1,500,000	2,000,000	1,500,000	Do.
Total.....					27,126,800	16,083,000	

EXPLANATION OF DOUGLAS AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 3790

A. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

The budget request for this item of \$7,396,000 was only slightly reduced by the Senate committee to \$7,369,790. This appropriation is divided almost equally between building and utilities on the one hand and roads and trails on the other of these two, the maintenance of roads is probably the more important.

My amendment would set this figure at \$5,500,000 which would be a saving of \$869,790. The cut should be allocated so that \$500,000 is applied to buildings and utilities with the lesser cut of \$369,790 applied to roads and trails. This cut would amount to only 12 percent in an item for maintenance.

B. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, CONSTRUCTION

The budget request for this item of \$11,975,000 is broken down as follows:

Parkways, \$5,825,000—Baltimore-Washington Parkway, \$4,200,000; Natchez-Trace Parkway, \$800,000; Suitland Parkway, \$825,000.

Roads and trails, \$3,000,000, as estimated. Buildings and utilities, \$1,400,000, as estimated.

Acquisition of lands and water rights, \$1,750,000.

Four million one hundred and fifty thousand dollars is for liquidation of prior contract authority. The Senate committee slightly reduced the request to \$11,370,000, denying \$500,000 for new roads and trails projects. I believe we can save another \$1,000,000, applying the cut primarily to roads and trails but also in some degree to the other items.

C. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES

The budget request for this item of \$6,870,000 is broken down as follows:

Administration of fish and game laws, \$1,624,636—increase of \$78,091.

Propagation and distribution of food fishes, \$2,107,809—increase of \$181,632.

Mammal and bird reservations, \$1,837,763—increase of \$168,250.

River basin studies, \$263,442—increase of \$49,382.

Control of predatory animals and injurious rodents, \$939,199—decrease of \$12,328.

Soil and moisture conservation, \$97,151—same as 1951.

The Senate committee slightly reduced this request to a figure of \$6,606,558 by a 10 percent cut in personal services and denying funds for river basin studies. I believe we can save another \$606,558 by denying all increases requested amounting to \$427,000 and squeezing the total program down by \$180,000, or about 3 percent.

D. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

The budget request for this item of \$4,046,000 is broken down as follows:

Research on fish and fisheries, \$1,990,971—increase of \$141,598 to provide for expanding West Coast Pilchard Fishery investigations and to cover investigations authorized by new legislation.

Exploration, development, and utilization of fishery resources, \$1,580,330—increase of \$86,650 to expand program on basis of new legislation.

Research on birds and mammals, \$474,699—increase of \$11,750, includes studies for administering Migratory Bird Treaty Act and cooperation with States and universities to give training in wildlife management.

The House cut this request to \$3,875,000 as the result of an amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia, who pointed out that this amount is the same as the sum provided last year. He objected to a 150-page booklet, on glass paper and with lithograph cuts, on racoons in North and Middle America, as well as to other publications and the time spent in their preparation. Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN stated that the Service had shown a stubborn and uncompromising attitude in its relations with the sportsmen of Minnesota.

The Senate committee made little change in the figure, recommending \$3,858,986. I believe we can save another \$358,000 on these investigations expenditures.

E. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The budget request for this item of \$22,900,000 is broken down as follows:

Topographic surveys and mapping, \$8,930,000—increase of \$1,650,000; geological and mineral resource surveys and mapping, \$6,130,000—increase of \$1,720,000 to provide for acceleration of mineral resources studies, increased scope of investigations of mineral fuels, expansion in general service geologic mapping, and remodeling space in Denver Federal Center; water resource investigations, \$6,015,000—increase of \$797,000 above the current year basis; soil and moisture conservation, \$41,000—no increase; classification of lands, \$354,000—increase of \$31,000; supervision of mining, oil, and gas leases, \$910,000—\$65,000 increase to provide operating staff 25 percent greater than in 1944 to handle workload 200 percent greater; general administration, \$520,000.

The Senate committee recommended \$21,300,000 for this item. My amendment would save another \$1,300,000 and still allow over \$1,100,000 above last year's figure. This will permit a substantial increase for topographic surveys and mapping which are needed, especially in Alaska. But it will stop all other increases requested.

I should also like to point out that waste exists in this agency. The Williams Report on the Geological Survey (H. Rept. 2457, issued last year, p. 117) says this about it:

"THE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY"

"The relationship of the Geological Survey with the Department is unique. It operates almost separate and apart from the Department, and there is little knowledge concerning its operation at the secretarial level. Its organization is made up of four highly professionalized divisions, which are practically independent of each other.

"The Geological Survey has paid little attention to the Department's efforts to decentralize its activities closer to the scene of its operations. It chooses to remain the most centralized activity within the Depart-

ment; yet each of the divisions maintains separate administrative services, including budget, personnel, accounting, and procurement services. Each division has its own supply room; and its scientific equipment, although consisting of many of the same items, are kept separately in the so-called central warehouse. Equipment and supplies are procured at seven different points in the headquarters organization.

"An attitude of intolerance toward good administrative practices pervades the organization. The following quotation, taken from a report submitted to the subcommittee by the Survey, serves to illustrate this attitude:

"In a highly technical engineering and scientific organization, such as the Geological Survey, recognition must, of necessity, be given to the difference between operating problems (involving scientific skills) and administrative, or housekeeping problems. Awareness of this distinction is of prime importance. For example, in many agencies the organization and management staff can be used interchangeably on either program or administrative problems, but not in the Survey. In the Survey, however, the usual type of operations and management analyst would be of no use if confronted with such a technical problem as how best to perfect the accurate measurement of flood flows through a survey of critical data after the flood has occurred. Such problems must be left to the employees who have competence in the many highly specialized fields of scientific endeavor which touch upon the Survey's operational programs. Because of this need for technical specialization, the Survey must assign the improvement of program techniques to its technical divisions. This necessary and practical arrangement precludes the segregation or formalizing of any segment of a program staff to devote full time to personnel management improvement activities. No study has ever been made of the portion of the total time that operating personnel spend in management improvement. The very fact that the Survey, throughout its expansion, has not only been able to keep its head above water, but has increased its reputation for professional competence, is ample evidence of the exercise of such considerable ingenuity that many a formalized staff in a static agency would proudly claim it as savings attributable to management improvement. For example, when the agency first undertook to test a sudden great increase in the number of samples of ore for the presence of uranium, it took highly skilled employees 2 weeks to make a single test. With the new techniques and equipment which were then developed it is possible for subprofessional personnel to test a sample in 2 minutes. The saving represented by the number of employees who would have been hired if the new technique had not been developed is significant. Here again, management experts could not have devised the most efficient method. The improvement was worked out by the technical staff."

"Here is a fertile yet difficult field for management improvement."

F. BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, GENERAL INVESTIGATION

The budget request for this planning item is \$5,500,000. The Senate committee recommended \$4,600,000. However, this request includes \$400,000 for planning work not authorized in the Central Valley where there is already \$300,000,000 worth of work for which plans are available on authorized projects. Another \$159,000 is for planning of the central Arizona project which already has a plan before Congress not yet authorized. Another \$334,000 is for planning of Colorado River storage and there is in existence a plan which is now awaiting comments.

This planning work can be cut back during a period of defense mobilization, and my amendment would cut the request to \$3,000,000, saving another \$1,600,000.

G. BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The budget request for this item is \$16,385,000, of which the Senate allowed \$16,168,594. I believe that here we should hold to the House figure of \$15,094,000 and save another million dollars in this overhead item.

H. BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The budget request for this item is \$6,000,000. However, the House committee has received reports of inefficiencies and overstaffing in several parts of the country. Hoarding valuable personnel, including engineers and technicians whose efforts might better be applied to defense effort is inexcusable. Reduction of construction and other reclamation projects makes it imperative that Bureau reduce administrative and other personnel, and take firm action toward consolidating regional and district organization and eliminating duplication. The Senate committee has recommended \$5,478,203, but I believe we should be able to save another million dollars in this item which is strictly overhead.

I. BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

The budget request for project construction totals \$223,690,000, of which the Senate committee recommended \$208,334,450. This huge sum includes a great many power projects essential to the defense effort. However, I believe we can save another \$16,000,000 by slowing down construction of some of the irrigation projects and making substantial reductions in planning funds.

The following projects would be affected by my amendment:

1. BOULDER CANYON PROJECT, ALL-AMERICAN CANAL SYSTEM, ARIZONA-CALIFORNIA

Approximately \$61,000,000 has been made available for this project which will cost approximately \$67,000,000. The requirements for fiscal year 1952 are estimated in the budget at \$180,000. The funds are requested for minor betterments to the desilting works and for maintenance during construction. This would appear to be primarily a maintenance item. However, both the House and the Senate committees increased this amount by including funds for the Coachella water district raising the amount above the budget figure. My amendment would retain the budget figure and save \$2,800,000.

2. CACHUM PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

The sum of \$11,500,000 is requested by the budget for this project estimated to cost \$31,520,000. The Senate committee reduced this request to \$10,000,000. Over \$13,500,000 have been provided thus far. The purpose of the project is to provide additional water to maintain existing irrigation, suburban, and urban developments and to permit future expansion for the city of Santa Barbara and water districts in the environs. The

works are scheduled for completion in fiscal year 1953. I believe we can reduce this fund by another million dollars without harming our investment there.

3. CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

The sum of \$38,350,000 is requested by the budget for this project estimated to cost over \$625,000,000 and for which over \$363,000,000 has been provided to date. The Senate committee reduced this request to \$33,900,000. It appears from the agency data that the funds requested would be used for the initiation of the Contra Costa canal and the Delta-Mendocino canal distribution systems as well as for continuing specific items under way. By reducing funds allocated to irrigation by 10 percent, we can save another \$2,700,000.

4. COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT, WASHINGTON

The sum of \$27,900,000 is requested by the budget for this project, which is estimated to cost in total as presently authorized \$715,100,000. The Senate committee reduced this request to \$27,000,000. To date \$414,033,000 has been provided. The agency presentation states that the program for fiscal year 1952 provides for continuation of work scheduled to be under way at the end of the current fiscal year and commencement of additional construction essential to achieving established program goals. The agency points out that the power shortage in the Pacific Northwest remains acute and that completion of power and related multipurpose facilities at Grand Coulee Dam is of primary importance. However, by reducing funds allocated to irrigation by 10 percent we can save another \$2,600,000.

5. MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

The data furnished by the agency indicates that this project as presently authorized will cost \$3,140,000,000. Of this amount some \$271,000,000 has already been provided and the sum of \$58,673,600 is requested in the budget for fiscal year 1952.

Phase A—Construction: The budget request for phase A is \$46,000,000 which was reduced to \$40,500,000 by the Senate committee.

The presentation states that the funds requested will provide for the substantial completion of the Boysen Dam and power plant, Key Hole and Cedar Bluff Dams, and the irrigation facilities of the Cartwright, Fort Clark, and N-Bow-N units. Several transmission lines and substations will be completed and placed in service. Construction will be continued on several projects now under way. The statement continues that construction activities will be initiated on the irrigation facilities of the Sadie Flat, Crow Creek, and Sidney units. In addition, final design and specifications will be under way on several units and the assembly of design data and development of unit plans will be continued on a number of others.

The Crow Creek unit of the Three Forks division, Montana, is estimated to cost \$1,550,000 and \$100,000 of the total amount requested for the Missouri River Basin would be used for letting a pumping-plant-equipment contract and the preparation of design and specification in fiscal year 1952. The sum \$581,900 is requested for the Sadie Flat unit, estimated to cost \$2,094,000. The funds would be used for completion of design and specifications, award of contracts, and initiation of construction of the pumping plants, canals, and laterals. For the Sidney unit, Yellowstone division, Montana, \$521,000 is requested for the project, estimated to cost \$920,000. In addition to preparation of plans and designs for the pumping plants, canals, and laterals, construction would be initiated on these features. No defense justification of these three units is given. By applying a 10-percent reduction to these

construction costs we can save another \$4,000,000. This whole cut should be applied to irrigation features.

Phase B—Units being prepared for construction: The sum of \$3,525,000 is requested in the budget for these units estimated to have a total construction cost of \$768,955,000. Phase B work consists of preconstruction surveys, investigations, and designs. The Senate committee reduced this amount to \$3,200,000. However, I believe we can save another \$1,500,000 on these planning funds.

Phase C—Continuing work on the general plan of development: For this portion of the work \$3,500,000 is requested by the budget. The Senate committee reduced this request to \$3,000,000. But these are also general investigations and I believe we can save another \$1,500,000 here.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to be transacted at this time, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, July 9, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 6 (legislative day of June 27), 1951:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Elbert G. Mathews, of California.

Henry E. Stebbins, of Massachusetts.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

M. Williams Blake, of Ohio.

William E. Flournoy, Jr., of Virginia.

John F. Stone, of Pennsylvania.

William D. Wright, of Tennessee, a Foreign Service reserve officer, to be a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Robert J. Boylan, of Illinois.

John A. Bywater, of the District of Columbia.

Kennedy M. Crockett, of Texas.

J. Alfred LaFreniere, of Massachusetts.

William F. Merrill, of Massachusetts.

John P. Nevins, of Vermont.

Thomas J. B. Wenner, of Ohio.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

John A. Noon, of Maryland.

William E. Phipps, Jr., of California.

Ray E. Lee, of Texas, a Foreign Service reserve officer, to be a consul and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Jesse R. Core 3d, of Texas.

Donald Y. Gilmore, of Massachusetts.

Marshall D. Rothe, Jr., of Florida.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Richard F. Allen, of the District of Columbia.

Roswell H. Whitman, of the District of Columbia.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Luther W. Youngdahl, of Minnesota, to be United States district judge for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. T. Alan Goldsborough, deceased.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment as chaplains of the Regular Army in the grade of first lieutenant under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

Walter S. McCleskey, O954169.
John V. Peters, O961893.
Jerome O. Sommer, O931456.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress, and Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, subject to physical qualification:

To be lieutenant colonel
George K. Lewis, MC, O253703.

To be majors
Ralph E. Conant, MC, O295442.
William S. Cornell, MC, O310237.
Paul A. Reed, MC, O381049.
James H. Smith, MC, O364247.

To be captains
John C. Carpenter, MC, O964449.
Enrico D. Carrasco, MC, O935760.
Arthur Cohen, MC, O935883.
Robert M. Fowler, MC, O977417.
Charles R. Green, MC, O935985.
Thomas D. Kelly, MC, O1766567.
Samuel V. King, MC, O992565.
Lawrence P. Kleuser, Jr., MC, O996046.
James G. McFaddin, MC, O1736407.
Henry H. Modrak, MC, O1775880.
Glenn H. Richmond, MC.
Hasell G. Ross, MC, O976251.
William J. Tiffany, Jr., MC, O1715946.

To be first lieutenants
Russell W. Bickley, DC, O2051412.
William B. Blackstone, MC, O977486.
Raymond J. Congour, DC.
Roy E. Daniel, DC, O808191.
Michael J. Davis, MC, O978750.
Eugene A. Garcia, DC, O981008.
Robert W. Little, DC, O446456.
Ralph B. Lydic, DC, O1556908.
Thomas O'Sullivan, DC, O722875.
Grace G. Palmer, WAC, L1010000.
Charles M. Powell, Jr., JAGC, O840851.
Irving Wikler, MC, O966304.
Hal C. Worcester, DC, O1755288.

To be second lieutenants
Milton Braveman, MSC, O707219.
Margaret M. Butler, WAC, L201148.
David W. Duttweiler, MSC, O981055.

Freeda L. James, WMSC, M2870.
Mary K. Leath, WMSC, M2873.
Julia E. Ledbetter, WAC, L1010095.
Frances L. T. McKinney, ANC, N792223.
Sarah F. Niblack, WAC, L201642.
Lois M. Nuhn, WAC, L1010243.
Florence A. Schmidt, WMSC, M2875.
Dorothy S. Siler, WAC, L1010040.
Helen D. Steir, WAC, L702161.
Barbara A. Stierle, WMSC, R2560.
Alice L. Turner, WAC, L1020599.
Frances O. Vandiver, ANC, N792530.
Eileen B. Witte, WMSC, R2556.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship, and subject to physical qualification:

John R. Daniels, O2203688.
Alan R. Hopeman, O2050512.
Heber S. Hudson, O2209678.
Lloyd Kitchen, O1039061.
George A. Levi, O341520.
Donald G. McLeod, Jr., O1048902.
Jack D. Reedy, O1542646.
Stephen N. Schanzer, O986956.
Paul W. Sheffer, O2209671.
James B. Standerfer, O2206697.
William A. Stephens, O1542877.
Henry T. Zelechovsky, O2037024.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

To be first lieutenants
Frank M. Bott, O933389.
Colin D. Ciley, Jr., O1186968.
Michael G. Collins, O1060047.
Jack D. Dougherty, O453521.
Walter J. Harbort, O450881.
George A. McCowen, O1118086.
Lee P. Moore, O1182197.
Robert C. Morris, O498281.
Bedell A. Tippins, Jr., O1296768.

To be second lieutenants
Charles P. Alter, O1648965.
Thomas J. Barnes.
Jerry F. Bradley, O2020244.
James B. Bryant, O957017.
Danford S. Carroll, O1342157.
Ray A. Clardy, O439388.
Arthur H. Collins, Jr., O1291077.
William M. Dickson, O1333440.
Michael A. DiGennaro, Jr., O974254.
Alexander R. Evans, O1688439.
Carlos L. Fraser, O1030768.
Edward C. Gustely, O556317.
Cam J. Hurst, Jr., O957029.
Joseph P. Jaugstetter, O443195.
Robert J. Landseadel, Jr., O557086.
William Nelson, O955894.
Charles E. Parrish.
Harlan A. Rasmusson, O1062904.
Herbert L. Sauermann, O2210152.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Carroll H. Blanchard, Jr.	Richard R. Heineke
Donald K. Blumenthal	Walter O. Johnson,
Richard B. Boughton	O978306
Wesley R. Bozone	Guy M. Lubold, Jr.
Kenneth J. Carah,	Frank R. Olcott
O2209967	Laurence C. Peabody
Douglas E. Christensen	George E. Pickett, Jr.
Donald E. Corum,	George H. Schubert
O221125	John E. Stuntz
Charles A. Dawdy, Jr.	William T. Tanner, Jr.
Leonard J. D'Eon	Edward E. Townsend
Edward A. Fraser	Robert S. Williams, Jr.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army, in the grade of first lieutenant in lieu of captain, Medical Corps, as previously nominated and confirmed:

Anthony A. Borski, O1534682.
Robert I. Bosman, O444500.
Roscoe C. Brand, Jr., O1169034.
Gerald J. Breakstone, O426719.
Otis E. Bridgeford, O1534685.
John E. Buess, O926884.
Thornton R. Cleek, O1041526.
James A. Ewart, O407299.
Hugh S. Geiger, Jr., O747124.
Robert W. Green, O388326.
Thomas M. Hall, O410302.
Joe S. Haney, Jr., O441260.
William O. Kearse, O366344.
Dean McCandless, O414073.
Gordon B. Miller, O451619.
Walter S. Mizell, O513096.
John de La S. Morris, O379853.
Harold W. Mueller, O2209654.
Robert C. Nelson, O363141.
Robert L. Obourn, O418579.
Matthew D. Parrish, O789498.
Arnold M. Reeve, O1296257.
William L. Richardson, O985652.
Thomas D. Sellers, O678337.
James A. Shafer, AO671116.
Leo H. Silverman, O325022.
John W. Stark, O460951.
Walter E. Switzer, O854290.
James C. Syner, O566870.
Lewis A. Van Osdel, O420535.
Lloyd T. Wright, O2209672.
Harry H. Youngs, Jr., O1535118.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 6 (legislative day of June 27), 1951:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Francis P. Matthews, of Nebraska, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

is for a just and enduring world peace, should offer earnest prayers to God that our representatives may be inspired and our foes persuaded to the point where the world may confidently go forward with a will to peace that will end the carnage which has plagued the world.

NEWS COVERAGE OF PEACE-TRUCE TALKS IN KOREA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for not more than 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from California may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Briefly, I wish to state that I hope some way will be found by General Ridgway and our command in the Far East to permit at least a selected group of American correspondents and photographers to attend the peace-truce talks which are scheduled to be held tomorrow in Kaesong. I believe that it would be perfectly feasible for a pooling arrangement to be made, so that several correspondents and photographers could represent all the American press associations and all the major American newspapers which have correspondents in that area of the world.

Reports coming from Korea yesterday indicated that at the preliminary meeting, where no American correspondents were allowed to be present, and where only at the last minute was one Army photographer allowed to be present, the Communists had present a number of photographers, motion picture cameramen and presumably reporters.

The world is interested in these proceedings. No one knows just what the outcome may be. But certainly the American people have contributed a great deal to this effort. American forces have contributed more than 350,000 men to the Korean fight whereas all the other members of the United Nations have contributed less than 10 percent of that number. The American people are entitled to be fully informed, and I believe that that could be more adequately guaranteed by having representation of the American press.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am informed that news has come over the ticker this morning to the effect that arrangements have been made for United Nations newspapermen and photographers to be on the truce train.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. Flanders] be permitted to proceed for 12 minutes, to present suggestions regarding a Korean settlement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Vermont may proceed.

SUGGESTIONS FOR A KOREAN SETTLEMENT

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, there has been much complaint on the part of Republican Members of Congress that our foreign policy, at least so far as concerns Asiatic matters, has not been bipartisan. That complaint was voiced before his death by Senator Vandenberg, who played such an important part in

developing a bipartisan policy for our relations with European nations.

It has seemed clear to me that members of our party should not sit patiently waiting for bipartisanship to be offered to us on a silver platter by our Democratic friends. There is no reason why we cannot make constructive contributions at any time. These contributions should be positive. They should be made publicly and they should be made early in the development of any situation to which they apply.

Keeping these points in mind, the following suggestions are offered as a contribution from the Republican side of the aisle to the attainment of a just and honorable peace in Korea. It would seem that the following requirements must be met:

First. Any Korean settlement to be effective must have as its primary objective the well-being of the Koreans themselves, both north and south.

Second. The settlement must strengthen the position and the responsibility of the United Nations, particularly in the eyes of the Asiatic peoples.

Third. It must allow none of the advantages which were sought for by aggression.

Fourth. It must be a Korean settlement of a Korean War, and we must not allow it to become entangled with the wider problems of relations between the Soviet Government and the western nations.

Fifth. It must offer advantages to all parties concerned.

To obtain these objectives it will be necessary to negotiate directly with Communist China. That country can make all the claims it pleases as to "volunteer" soldiers. Arms, ammunition, tanks, and planes did not "volunteer." They were furnished by a government which thus establishes itself as a belligerent in opposition to the United Nations.

Correspondingly the Soviet denies responsibility for the aggression which we have been resisting. We cannot pin responsibility on the Soviet Government in the way in which we can on the munitions and planes which came over from Manchuria. We should therefore take Russia's words at their face value and not include her in the negotiations.

We must be careful to separate the armistice discussions from the peace settlement. The armistice will deal with military matters only. It will, for instance, not concern itself with the blockade of China by the powers of the United Nations, so that the blockade should still continue in full force until the political agreements have been reached in the subsequent peace negotiations. The peace negotiations themselves should be between China, North and South Korea, and the United Nations. These are the admitted or self-admitted parties to the present conflict. By this means entanglement with the major problems of the relations between the Soviet Government and the western nations will be side-tracked.

Not only will the peace problem be simplified and limited by this means but also its conclusion will be hastened, since the economic sanctions applying to

Communist China will be continued in full force until a settlement has been arrived at. There will be no incentive for stalling on the part of Communist China.

With the Koreans, North and South, a 3-year agreement might be negotiated for repairing devastation and for reestablishing agriculture and industry in a country which will again have a working balance between the industrial north and the food-raising south. With proper guidance it can become a self-sustaining country.

The peace terms might very well include the demilitarization of a strip of land of suitable width along the Manchurian border of Korea, said strip of land to be under the surveillance, but not under the government, of the United Nations to assure that it was not being used for any military purposes. This gives assurance that Manchuria will not be threatened, and this should relieve the fears of the Communist government, which has claimed in broadcasts from Peiping that its only interest in the Korean War is the protection of the Manchurian border from attack.

The most difficult point in these proposals is to persuade the North Koreans to cease their conflict and join with South Korea to make a united country. This evidently would not be relished by the Communist leaders of North Korea, who nevertheless could retire to enjoy the blessings of their faith in Manchuria or anywhere else that such blessings are available. Their misled followers should be favorably impressed by the United Nations offer to rebuild the country. It is this offer to rebuild the country as a part of the peace terms that would give the settlement an entirely new turn and establish a landmark in the history of peace terms and peace treaties. It would be hard to justify a rejection of such terms. Any group who supported rejection would expose themselves in the eyes of the world as seeking war rather than peace.

It is most interesting that a Moscow dispatch dated July 6 predicts that Communist Korea will demand aid from the United Nations in rebuilding ruined cities, transports, and private homes. We must insist upon just what the Communists will needlessly demand. Only after an agreed upon period of rebuilding should general elections be held.

A solution like this, so obviously free of power politics and so obviously directed toward the healing of the nations, can scarcely fail to result in a better understanding of United Nations purposes and procedures by all the people of Asia who have been unduly susceptible to Communist propaganda.

All of this will have been attained without yielding to the blackmailing attempt of Communist China to "shoot its way into the United Nations," to use the picturesque expression of our own Ambassador Austin, and without making damaging arrangements as to Formosa and the Nationalist Army.

As to ourselves—our soldiers and their families—I need say little, except that we must be on guard, even though the fighting on this front may cease. We

must indeed dig in for the long pull. We must adjust our economy, our social planning and our defense to a sustained effort which we can safely carry on for years if necessary. It is only against the background of such a sustained effort that we can hope to attain our ultimate objectives of a disarmed, peaceful, and prosperous world.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, the Interior Department appropriation bill.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	McFarland
Anderson	Hayden	McKellar
Benton	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bricker	Hennings	Monroney
Bridges	Hill	Moody
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Morse
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Mundt
Eyrd	Humphrey	Neely
Cain	Hunt	Nixon
Capehart	Ives	O'Connor
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Clements	Kefauver	Russell
Connally	Kem	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Knowland	Stennis
Duff	Langer	Taft
Dworshak	Lehman	Tobey
Eastland	Lodge	Underwood
Ecton	Long	Watkins
Ellender	Magnuson	Welker
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	McCarran	Williams
Frear	McCarthy	Young
Fulbright	McClellan	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave

of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The clerk will state the first amendment which was passed over.

The first amendment passed over was, on page 2, after line 4, to insert:

CONSTRUCTION, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, to remain available until expended, \$342,020.

The sum of \$1,758,400, the unobligated portion of the \$1,850,000 appropriation contained in chapter V of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 911, 81st Cong.), under the heading "Department of the Interior, Southeastern Power Administration, construction," is hereby rescinded and shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this act.

CHECKS ON INFLATION—ECONOMIC CONTROLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to an article which appears in today's issue of the United States News and World Report, entitled "We Still Need Controls." I shall take the liberty of reading a question or two from the article, and Mr. Eric Johnston's replies thereto. I want to commend the United States News for inserting within its pages such an excellent article as this question-and-answer article between the editors of the United States News and Mr. Johnston. I especially commend them because the contents of Mr. Johnston's answers are so much at variance with what I have interpreted to be the editorial policy of the United States News for several weeks past that I am glad such an effective answer to that editorial policy is to be found in Mr. Johnston's answers to the questions put to him by the editors of United States News. The first question:

The feeling now is, Mr. Johnston, that with the Korean War ending, you won't need anything more in the way of controls; isn't that so?

I have noticed, Mr. President, that in the so-called dope sheets or prediction sheets of the United States News, an effort has been made to leave that impression with the reader; and it is a rather widespread impression in these days. It is a dangerous impression, Mr. President, from the standpoint of the security of our country, and I am glad that Mr. Johnston hit it on the nose squarely in the answer to the first question which was put to him by the editors of this magazine, in which he said:

If that's the case, then you won't get anything. And if that's the case we might just as well look for a much cheaper dollar a couple of years from today than we have. It is now worth about 53 or 54 cents in 1939

purchasing power. My guess is that it might be worth between 30 and 40 in 1939 purchasing power, in 10 years if you don't do something about controlling inflation.

I do not know what we can do more than Mr. Johnston is trying to do in this interview to make clear to the American people the danger of inflation. We repeat and repeat and repeat to the American people the great danger they are running if they do not recognize that adequate checks on inflation must be adopted. The American people themselves are going to have to tighten their belts and make the sacrifices necessary to preserve what I think is, after all, the most precious thing we have, namely, the economic freedom which is ours, upon which all our political freedom ultimately rests. Paradoxical as it may sound the fact is that without adequate controls during this period of defense spending our free economy may sacrifice its freedom through ruinous inflation.

The next question put to Eric Johnston is in line with what I have interpreted for some weeks past to be the editorial slant of the United States News, and the editors got their ears pinned back again with Mr. Johnston's answer to the next question which they put to him. They asked:

What if you shave the rearmament program 25 percent, as is to be expected?

I do not know who expects it. I do not know why we should expect it, but I am satisfied, as a member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, that it would be a dangerous and risky thing to shave back the rearmament program. We had better not be shaving it back, Mr. President; we had better proceed full steam ahead with it, and place ourselves in such a condition that Russia will understand we are ready and able to absorb the first shock of war with her, if she decides on a course of war-like action. I refuse to believe that we must wait until some American city is bombed, in order to cause the American people to appreciate fully the danger which confronts them. Listen to Mr. Johnston's answer:

If you shave 25 percent, you can shave 25 percent of the pressures. I don't think you can eliminate them. I think if you shave it by 50 or 60 or 70 percent—yes, you can eliminate the pressures, if you want to take that chance and do it. Personally, as one who has been in Russia a couple of times, I think we're darn fools to take that chance. I think we ought to be strong.

In my opinion, he could not tell the American people a greater truth than that. I believe the American people ought to do the things which are necessary in order to be in a position to lead through strength and not meet the danger of a Russian threat in what I consider to be the all-too-weak condition in which we presently find ourselves.

Then, the next question also represents an attitude of mind which I think has come to characterize a great many editors in this country who overlook the fact that, after all, they have a job to do, too, in making the facts known to the American people. The question is:

The public reaction is to grow strong more slowly, though?

CONTROLS—OR INFLATION

Question. In the time allotted—perhaps it will be over a longer period of time?

Answer. I can tell you what the plan is; whether they will expend it or not is something different. If you spend the sum of money you've got to do one of these things: Either you've got to have much more rigid controls that you now have—by that I mean particularly more rigid indirect methods, credit controls, higher taxes, much greater savings on the part of the people—or you've got to face a very rapid inflation. That's the choice. Now the only other alternative is to extend the expenditure of defense money over a more protracted period than a year and half or so.

Question. That is probable, isn't it, if the Korean War ends?

Answer. Maybe, but I personally think it is a great mistake—

Question. What is a great mistake?

Answer. To slow our rearmament over more than a 2-year period. In other words, I think it is a great mistake not to go ahead with rearmament as planned.

Question. Where would you store all the stuff?

Answer. There isn't that much to store—40 to 50 percent is actual plant expansion or defense buildings, etc.

Question. You're talking about a \$90,000,000 annual budget for 1953. What is the 1952 budget?

Answer. Around sixty-eight to seventy billion.

Question. So you have an increase of about twenty billion. What is the basic reason for that increase?

Answer. In the first place, you will have a larger armed force, and, in the second place, you will begin to pay in quantity for the things that you're ordering today and the rest of this year—the planes, the ships, the tanks, all the other things. For instance, the Atomic Energy Commission will spend considerably more. That's required. The bigger planes run into a great deal of money—some of them cost around \$2,000,000 apiece—and those are being delivered in very small quantities today. Beginning 8 or 10 months from now, they'll be delivered in volume. It takes a long time to tool up for them. That is true, too, of some of the ship construction which is just beginning to get under way.

Question. What about this 6½-billion-dollar building program of military construction?

Answer. That's for this year.

Question. Just 1 year?

Answer. That's right. It's in Alaska, the Pacific, and all over the country.

Question. That will go ahead?

Answer. This program should go ahead and go ahead rapidly.

Question. Should these defense items cost as much as they do? How do you know these prices aren't too high—what about price controls?

Answer. Many of the defense contracts, as you know, are negotiated contracts. They are let on a bid and then they are negotiated during the period of delivery.

Then, take a bomber: A B-29 in the last war cost, as I remember the figures, less than \$500,000. A B-50 today costs over two million. Of course, it is a much bigger plane.

TAXES, SAVINGS FIRST, THEN CONTROLS

Question. Your formula for restraining inflation is to put a ceiling on prices and on wages, isn't it?

Answer. No, no. I think that is only part of it—a necessary but the minor part. I think, in the first place, you've got to start from a solid foundation of indirect controls, such as an adequate tax program, increased savings, very much increased savings. Let me

give you some figures. In 1944 we saved \$35,000,000,000. At the present rate of national income, if we saved on the same proportion, it would be fifty-five billion. We actually saved, in the first quarter of this year, at an annual rate of around ten billion. That includes savings bonds, insurance, all the forms of saving. Now, if we could increase that to twenty-five billion or two and a half times, and we get a seven-billion tax program, we'd be safe from inflation for a while. But does anybody have any idea you can increase that ten up to twenty-five billion in savings?

Question. Do you plan on compulsory savings?

Answer. No; I'm not thinking of compulsory savings—I'm opposed to that. I'm thinking of incentives to get people to save. Then you've got to have credit restrictions. One of the reasons for the softness in some lines today is the pressure on commercial banks to liquidate inventories. Mr. Charles E. Wilson and his credit committee are doing a fine job in the credit area today. Commercial credit has gone up steadily since Korea. From the time of Korea up to March of this year it rose a little more than \$10,000,000,000, or about 19 percent. So something had to be done. Now the banks are cooperating admirably, in my opinion, with the credit committee. It is one of the few instances of voluntary cooperation which is actually working. Now the banks are doing it; they are reducing their loans. That's one of the pressures that you have. But it is a temporary pressure, as I'm trying to say. In my opinion, it is temporary.

HIGHER PRICES IF TERMS ARE EASED

Question. Isn't the reverse going on? The automobile people want the down payments and terms shifted, and we hear every other day that you're going to do it?

Answer. No; that's a matter for the Federal Reserve. We hope it doesn't do it. If it is done for automobiles, why shouldn't you do it for television sets and other consumer durables? We think it's the wrong direction to go. It's not the right direction to help stabilize the economy. The inflationary pressures from extending the time from 15 to 18 months for paying for used cars would be so great that it would raise the price of a used car by a substantial amount. That would more than cancel out the 3 months' additional extension. We're opposed to it.

The same groups which say we should not have wage and price controls; we must use only the indirect method, taxation, credit controls, and so on—they tell that to the Banking Committees, then go around to the House Ways and Means Committee and say we mustn't have taxes on the articles they sell.

But who is the worst hit by inflation? I think the very groups who are most opposed to direct controls. I think they are the ones who in the long run lose a great deal.

Direct controls, in my opinion, are not worth too much unless you have good, solid, indirect controls. I think you've got to have indirect controls. And on top of that, I think you've got to have direct controls for a relatively short period of time.

Now, why do I say that? Canada is using the indirect-control method. While I was up in Canada recently they gave me some figures. Canada has much more rigid indirect controls than anything you would contemplate in this country, or ever stand for. Their down payment on a consumer durable, irrespective of what it is, an automobile or others, is 50 percent. Ours is from 15 to 33½ percent, depending on the item. The automobile is 33½ percent, the highest. They have 12 months to pay. We have 15 months.

In addition to that type of control, they have a 25-percent excise tax on autos and a

10-percent sales tax, which is 35 percent. We have an 8-percent Federal tax on an automobile. A Ford car costing \$1,800 here costs \$2,500 in Canada.

Question. But haven't you got a different situation than we had in the war period? You've got this inflationary pressure coming, and you've got these restrictions that you're talking about—direct and indirect. How long are you going to have them on? Is there any plan as to when they will be relaxed?

Answer. Yes, definitely. We think that you have to have wage and price controls. I'm talking about direct controls, not the indirect controls, which nobody seems to disagree with in theory but many do disagree with in particular application to themselves. The direct controls we think should be relinquished within the next 24 months. We think then there will be enough production of steel—steel will be up to 118,000,000 tons by the middle of 1953. We think that that can take care of military and civilian requirements, and that there will be no black market in steel. There may even be a small steel surplus.

Aluminum production by the middle of 1953 will be up to 1,100,000 tons, from 700,000 tons at the start of Korea. The same is true of electric-power capacity—it will be up 40 percent. And we can go on down the list. There should be enough capacity to take care of regular civilian demand and the defense effort, and then controls should be removed. And our office is planning a system for the removal of controls.

PROGRAMS WITH WAR, AND WITHOUT

We're planning two programs. We're thinking of what would happen in case there were all-out war—what do you do in case of all-out war? What happens to the whole economy—to the flower store, to the millinery store, to the nonessential industries? What happens to essential industry and its manpower in all-out war? But in case there isn't all-out war in the next 2 years, we think controls can be removed and a program instituted for their orderly removal. We're working on that.

Question. You've got the direct wage and price control, and the indirect controls, which are credit and regulation of materials, and now you come to taxes. Have you people made any recommendation as to the kind of tax bill that would siphon off these savings?

Answer. We have never made any recommendation as to specific details of a tax bill we should have. We recommended the amount of taxes we feel are needed to help stabilization.

We have not presented an actual tax program; we have gone along with the Treasury's tax program and have endorsed the Treasury's tax request, which, as you know, is a tax on individuals, corporations, and excise taxes on commodities. Personally, I feel you have to raise more of this money from the lower- and middle-income groups than you have in the past, because there is the great spending power. It isn't easy to do. We are doing what we can to back a tax program recommended by the Treasury Department.

Question. What happens now if the war ends?

Answer. I wish I knew. Korea is only a small part of the defense program, so far as expenditures go, but psychologically it's a big part.

Question. It's a big part until they start in Iran or somewhere else?

Answer. A lot of things could happen. It could be the country would decide to remove these controls, or to postpone the armament program. I don't know what the answer is—I wish I knew. But I feel very strongly it would be a great mistake to let down our guard, to curb the defense program, no matter what happens in Korea.

NARROWING THE GAP

Question. Can we afford rearmament? What you're saying is that you're going to have a \$25,000,000,000 gap there 2 years from now no matter what we do?

Answer. No, I said a gap up to twenty billion to twenty-five billion dollars if you didn't get an adequate tax program, if you didn't get an adequate savings program, and if you didn't get an adequate credit-control program. I think if you can have those things you can narrow the gap down, perhaps to nothing.

Question. Are you talking about the cash gap now?

Answer. Yes, I'm talking about the cash gap.

Question. What about the budget gap? Do you think we can collect \$90,000,000,000 in taxes?

Answer. With a reasonable tax program I think you can keep the Federal budget deficit in 1953 someplace between eighteen and twenty-two billion dollars. In 1954 it's hoped to have that drop to about eight billion.

Question. At what level of expenditure?

Answer. The expenditures will drop down after 1953. That will be your big year.

Question. How do you get savings from ten to twenty-five billions without even a war on?

Answer. I think you would have much more savings with a higher national income.

Question. You don't see any deflation?

Answer. Yes; I think you could possibly have deflation. You've got to be very flexible about this whole program. I think you could have deflation. If you have a Korean peace, if the American people begin to feel that everything is all right, prices are coming down and they don't need to buy, and if the Congress refuses to appropriate money for a continuation of the defense effort on the scale as it now stands, I think you could have deflation. How much, I don't know.

Question. Is that a 50-50 prospect?

Answer. I don't think so. But it is a possibility. It's not a probability, however.

Question. Could you have a deflationary period for a few months, even without any curtailment of spending? As a psychological reaction to this?

Answer. Yes that is what I had hoped we would have—not substantial deflation, but some deflation during the next few months. It is so much easier to get control of the whole situation and to lay the correct foundation and framework to withstand the future inflation. Yes; I think you can have deflation.

Question. What happens to plant expansion?

Answer. I think a decrease in nonessential plant expansion would be very healthy. We have been spending at the rate of \$24,000,000,000 a year for the first 5 months of this year for plant expansion. I think that's a mistake. When this emergency is over we're going to need a lot of projects that people want. The reason we had such great prosperity following the war was the fact that we had a great deal of underconsumption.

I think if we can defer now some of these things that we want, we need not have a depression after this emergency. The additional plant capacity can be absorbed. But I think if we have to have everything we want today, plus our military program—and I think the American productive capacity is almost equal to it—then I have some serious doubts as to what we'll have in 19-x, whatever that year is.

Question. You're not going to get a law that's any different than you have now?

Answer. If we get the present law we can live under it and operate under it, in my opinion, and hold prices for the rest of this year. If we get a weaker law, all bets are off.

Question. How about wages—do you think you can work out a wage formula, or will you have another withdrawal of the unions?

Answer. No, I think you can work out a formula that will stabilize wages. I've requested the Board to try to come up with one soon. We urgently need such a formula.

What do you think the wage rates for industries essential to defense would be if you didn't have wage controls? I'll tell you what they would be, pretty nearly. I can tell you by past experience. In the year from January 1950, to February 1, 1951, only 2,500,000 workers in America got a 10 percent or more wage increase. And what do you think those increases were? Almost exclusively steel, coal, aluminum, motors, and aircraft. Those are the defense industry. Motors produce 35 to 40 percent of the entire war effort today. Now the pressures in those industries are terrific for wage increases. Without controls they'd shoot way up.

Because these key industries are highly organized and are needed for defense, because they're short on manpower and can use all the employees they can get, they'd pay almost any wage.

WHY WAGE CONTROLS ARE NEEDED

Question. The same thing is going to have to happen in all other industries, then?

Answer. Of course. And that's why I think you have to have wage controls, and anybody is just wishfully thinking if he thinks we can have a full-employment economy with defense work on a time-and-material basis and not have strong wage controls. I don't blame the unions. I'm not critical of the unions or businessmen or anyone else. I don't blame them. All of us would get it if we could.

Question. Do you think labor will walk out?

Answer. No, I don't think so.

Question. Are employers going to resist?

Answer. Let's be practical about these things. When you get back to a normal economy of market prices, law of supply and demand—yes, management will resist. And they will resist effectively inordinate wage demands. But not very strongly today, in my opinion.

PROBLEM OF LABOR PIRACY

Question. What protection are you going to be able to give against the hiring of labor by these groups? If you have these frozen schedules isn't it easy for a man to leave one place and go to another and be upgraded in the other one, so that you can lose all your employees that way?

Answer. You have to do just as you did in the last war. There was some of that, but not much. You had some of it going on, but you controlled it fairly well.

Question. Wasn't it controlled in the last war by refusing to give them certificates which permitted them to take the other job when they resigned from a job?

Answer. In general that was never used.

Question. But they had that as a threat?

Answer. We don't think that is going to be essential.

Question. You haven't begun to exercise your authority under the existing law on wage control, have you?

Answer. We haven't enforced it all along the line yet.

Question. Therefore you're going to get tight enforcement if you're going to do anything?

Answer. If you get into a position where you have to, yes. But personally I don't think we will get into that position. We're not in all our war. We're still going to give a large amount of consumer goods to people.

Question. Take all these unorganized industries where they try to operate under your rules—you're just going to find it more and more difficult in those industries to apply any standards such as you've got in the unionized industries?

Answer. I don't agree with you.

Question. But what standard are they going to use? Ten percent above January 1950? For everybody?

Answer. That's right.

Question. White-collar workers and executives, too?

Answer. That's right.

Question. What are your gradations? You've got your escalators?

Answer. Yes, you can hold it fairly well.

I am opposed to controls, but all I am trying to say is that I think you can hold a rearguard action in this whole process better with controls than you can without controls.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in closing I wish to commend Mr. Eric Johnston for his industrial statesmanship and for his courage. Here is a great industrialist, as wedded as is any Member of the Senate of the United States to the preservation of the free-enterprise system, who recognizes that in order to prevent the free-enterprise system from turning into a license to exploit the consumers during an inflationary period it is essential that the Congress adopt a stronger and a more effective control program. I not only commend Mr. Johnston, but I recommend to the Senate and to the American people the reading of his article.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk state the first committee amendment which was passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The clerk has already stated the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. That amendment, which appears on page 2, lines 5 to 19, is in two parts. The last part is a rescission of \$1,758,400, representing the unobligated portion of the appropriation of \$1,850,000 made last year for the construction of a transmission line from Buggs Island to Langley Field in Virginia. That appropriation was made because up to that time the Virginia Power Co. had been unable, or had not actually made any kind of an agreement to carry power and deliver it to the aeronautical service of the United States at Langley Field. Congress, therefore, made an appropriation to build that line. But in the meantime, as happened in so many other parts of the United States, the company found a way to make a contract satisfactory to itself and satisfactory to the Government, with the result that it was not necessary to spend the money which it is here proposed to return to the Treasury. We have had a similar experience in a number of places in the United States. That is the reason why the committee asks for the adoption of the first part of the amendment, which provides "for construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, as applied to the southeastern power area, to remain available until expended, \$342,020."

That sum of money is to be divided into two parts. First, in the Roanoke River Basin, survey and plans for a transmission line direct from the Buggs Island Dam to Kinston, N. C., \$23,520, and second, Savannah River Basin, Clark Hill to Greenwood transmission line, 150 kilovolts at \$318,500. This is what the committee says in its report:

The committee has approved the two foregoing items with the definite understanding that the funds recommended therefor are not to be used if the Southeastern Power Administration and the public utility companies in the areas concerned can enter into wheeling agreements for the transmission of power from the Buggs Island Dam to Kinston, N. C., and for the transmission of power from the Clark Hill Dam to Greenwood, S. C.

The committee goes on to say that—

Considerable progress has been made in the last few years in the negotiation of wheeling agreements in other areas of the United States, and the committee knows of no valid reasons why similar agreements cannot be obtained in the southeastern area of the United States.

Then we suggest in our report:

The committee, therefore, directs the Southeastern Power Administration and the Secretary of the Interior to exhaust every possible effort to obtain proper wheeling agreements before utilizing the funds recommended for the above-mentioned facilities. It is the hope of the committee that it will not be found necessary to use these funds. In the judgment of the committee, fair and reasonable offers should be made by the public utility companies in the areas concerned for the wheeling of power from the Buggs Island and the Clark Hill Dams to preferred customers of the Government under section 5 of the 1944 Flood Control Act, and likewise in the judgment of the committee when fair and reasonable offers are made by the public utility companies such offers should be accepted by the Secretary of the Interior as the distributor of public power under section 5.

Continuing, the report says:

As stated, very encouraging progress has been made in obtaining wheeling agreements in other areas of the United States, and the committee sincerely hopes that not only with respect to the Kinston, N. C., area and the Greenwood, S. C., area, but with respect to the entire area covered by the Southeastern Power Administration similar progress can be reported to in the negotiation of wheeling agreements.

That is the sum and substance of it. We tried the plan first in the Southwestern power area, where 2 years ago, as Senators will remember, we appropriated \$6,000,000 for the construction of transmission lines, expressing the hope that it would not be necessary to spend it if the public utilities and the Southwestern Power Administration could get together upon an appropriate wheeling agreement. They did, and very satisfactory contracts were made, satisfactory to the companies and satisfactory to the Government, with the result that we rescinded the \$6,000,000 which had been previously appropriated. Appropriations were made last year with the same idea in mind, in Colorado, in Montana, and in California. Similar arrangements were made by the Reclamation Service and by the Bonneville Power Administration with private utilities, so that it was not necessary to spend the money.

We know of no other way of assuring the carrying out of the purpose of the Flood Control Act, which gives preference to preferred customers, such as Rural Electrification Administration co-operatives, to municipalities, to Government itself, except by working out proper wheeling agreements. And if that can be done we would like to see it done. For that reason I hope the committee proposal will prevail.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I wish to oppose the first part of the amendment, the part relative to making an appropriation for building a transmission line from Buggs Island to Kinston, N. C., and which provides for the building of a transmission line from Clark Hill to Greenwood, S. C. These lines run through North and South Carolina. This matter was considered by the House committee and by the full session of the House. It was fought out there all the way through and defeated. I think it should be defeated in the Senate. I have no objection, of course, to the second part of the amendment. I think that is entirely proper. But I do not believe the appropriation should be adopted by the Senate.

Let us analyze for a few minutes what is involved. One part provides for building a line which would cost approximately \$1,000,000, according to the estimate, but probably \$1,500,000 under present prices. There is an appropriation made of \$23,250 for surveying. That is from Buggs Island to Kinston. Already the Carolina Light & Power Co. has made contracts for Goldsboro, which is one of the places mentioned in the report for Wilson, and for Rocky Mount, both of which are mentioned in the report, and the company has been ready and willing all the time to make contracts to transmit the power at a cheaper rate than the Government could do it after building these lines.

The company made contracts with the electric cooperatives, but when they went to the Southeastern Power Administration they were handed a sort of ultimatum, to the effect "Here are seven things you have to agree to before we will even talk to you about making a contract." That is the attitude the Southeastern Power Administration has assumed. That is the arrogance with which they have approached this matter. The Carolina Light & Power Co. has been willing to make a contract and transmit this power cheaper than the Government could do it after it builds its line, and has offered in every conceivable way to proceed. There would be no difficulty at all in making that sort of a contract if it could deal with the committee of the Senate, with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, my friend the Senator from Arizona, who is always fair, and with the whole committee. But what the Southeastern Power Administration wants to have a gun placed at the head of the company and to say, "If you do not make the sort of a contract we want we will pull the trigger."

I want the power transmitted. This line runs in North Carolina. It serves the people of my State. But the Caro-

lina Light & Power Co. has the lines already built. There is no need in the world for the Congress to authorize the expenditure of \$1,000,000 to provide what has already been provided. The very minute this appropriation is defeated, I do not think there will be any difficulty about signing the contract.

Let us look at one other feature in that connection, to show the attitude with reference to the building of these transmission lines. The power company in eastern North Carolina known as the Tidewater is a small company. It does not serve a large number of people, and therefore has had a high rate. The Carolina Light & Power Co., together with the Virginia Electric & Power Co., decided that they wanted to do something to help out the cooperatives in that section. They worked out a formula and contract by which they would reduce rates, and enable this small company to reduce rates to the cooperatives in eastern North Carolina. As a result of the contract which they submitted, the cooperatives would have saved \$25,000 a month. That contract was submitted in January 1950. Instead of being acted upon, it was sent to Mr. Wickard, in Washington, the Director of REA. That contract is still lying upon his desk. It has not been executed, and the cooperatives of eastern North Carolina have lost more than \$300,000 in the higher rates which they are paying, and which they would not have had to pay if the contract had been executed.

What does the Department want? It wants appropriations for transmission lines. That is what this controversy is about. I do not believe the Government of the United States ought to deal with its citizens in that fashion. If this appropriation is defeated, I do not believe there will be any trouble. The power company stands ready to make a contract, and there is not a single kilowatt of power to be transmitted until 1953. There is all that time. If for any reason the contract is not signed by January 1, the Congress will be back in session and can provide whatever is necessary. There will be a whole year in which to do it.

I do not believe that the Government of the United States wants to assume an additional burden of more than \$1,000,000 to build a line which the people themselves do not want, and which the public does not want.

Let me read a brief statement from an editorial in the Kinston (N. C.) Daily Free Press, published at Kinston, N. C., the very place where they are talking about building this line:

The Free Press has had numerous comments regarding the proposed distribution by REA of current to be generated at the Buggs Island plant, Government constructed on the Roanoke River just across the State line in Virginia.

This paper has opposed any expenditure of tax money for extension or distribution lines in eastern Carolina on the ground that such expenditure is unnecessary and would be unjustified.

The editorial discusses the question in full. This newspaper is published at the point to which it is proposed to build the line under discussion. It is wholly un-

necessary. I do not think there is any justification for the Government making an appropriation merely to give the Southeastern Power Association a club with which to deal with someone. That is not the American way. It is not our Government's way. It should not be the way of dealing of any sort of business concern.

I shall not take further time to discuss that part of the project. I wish to talk about the part in South Carolina.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he leaves that subject?

Mr. HOEY. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Can the Senator give us an idea of what would be the cost of transmitting the power by private line?

Mr. HOEY. Yes. A proposal has already been made. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that the power company agrees to transmit the power at a lower rate than the Government can possibly transmit it if the lines are built. The company has said, "We will make a wheeling agreement." The Department has said, "We do not want you to put in anything about a wheeling agreement."

The whole attitude has been that of resentment toward the making of a contract. The Department does not want a contract. It wants to build transmission lines. Those of us who are familiar with the attitude of the Interior Department know that it wants to supplant private power with public power everywhere possible. It does not want a contract to be made, and that is the only reason it has not been made.

I should like to speak a little about the proposed line from Clark Hill to Greenwood, S. C. However, before I leave the other subject, let me say that the Carolina Light & Power Co., is not an octopus. It has 30,000 stockholders in North and South Carolina. No single stockholder owns more than 2 percent of the stock of the company. It is owned by the people. The people are interested in it. It has served Goldsboro for 40 years. It has served Wilson, and other places where it is proposed to build transmission lines. The cooperatives have all signed contracts with the power company. This proposed project is not desired at Kinston. It is wholly unnecessary. I mention that as incidental to showing the attitude of the people in my State in connection with this matter.

Coming to the Clark Hill-Greenwood transmission line, an appropriation of \$318,500 is proposed. That project would cost \$1,068,000, on the basis of the estimate, but, of course, the cost at the present time would be very much more than that. If this appropriation is granted, it means that this project will be constructed. The South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. and the Duke Power Co. have offered to sign, and are willing to sign, a contract similar to the Georgia contract, which has been approved. They are willing to sign a contract which would do just what the committee wants done, and that is to transmit the power at a more reasonable figure than the Government possibly could do it, result-

ing in the savings of an expenditure of \$1,500,000 to build this line.

In the case of the Clark Hill-Greenwood project, the Southeastern Power Administration has already signed a contract. It did not even wait for an appropriation. It went ahead and signed a contract. Now it wants this appropriation of \$323,000, which is approximately a third of the cost, if they could build it for what they thought they could. They are going to begin building it. They are not going to give a chance for a contract. If they get this authority they are going to start work to build that line, because that is what they want to do. I do not believe they should be granted that authority.

I may say in passing that the Duke Power Co. was a pioneer in hydroelectric development in North and South Carolina. If one were to travel over both States, he would find great industrial expansion and development, due to the fact that cheap power was brought to the people of those commonwealths. The power company serves the rural cooperatives. The Duke Power Co. has more than 500,000 customers. Of that number, a large percentage are rural cooperatives. Why supplant that arrangement and build a new transmission line, when facilities can be provided by the existing corporations engaged in that sort of business?

Mr. President, I think these appropriations are wholly unnecessary. They would represent expenditures of anywhere from two and one-half to three million or four million dollars if they were voted, because this is only the beginning. I can see no reason in the world for these appropriations. The House of Representatives defeated both of them. Members of the House of Representatives from North and South Carolina practically unanimously opposed them in the House, and they were defeated there. I do not believe they ought to be passed by the Senate.

There is just ground for feeling that the Interior Department wants to have Government control and regulation of power, rather than to have the business carried on by private industry. My reason for saying that is a situation which now exists and has existed for some time in North Carolina. When the Buggs Island appropriation was made, I voted for it. I wanted to develop power. I wanted flood control on the Roanoke River. In the Buggs Island development, there were some 8 or 10 other dams which it was suggested the Government might build. Among those was one at Roanoke Rapids. The Government has not done anything about it, and will not do anything at any time soon.

It so happened that the Virginia Electric & Power Co. owned the site at Roanoke Rapids. In October 1948 it filed an application with the Federal Power Commission to build a dam for \$28,000,000. The Federal Power Commission appointed an examiner to hear the case. He proceeded to hear it. After he had heard it for a while, the Interior Department came forward and asked permission to intervene. It opposed the project. That controversy has been going on during 1949 and 1950. The Department has offered everything in the

way of delay. It has hindered the project and has held it up. Finally, when the examiner made his report in favor of permitting the Virginia Electric & Power Co. to build the dam at Roanoke Rapids, the Department asked that the case be reopened. It wanted to offer more testimony. That was done. Finally the case came before the Federal Power Commission, and the Federal Power Commission, after full hearing, with the Interior Department fighting it all the way through, gave a unanimous decision that the Virginia Electric & Power Co. should build the dam.

What then happened? The Department went to the circuit court and applied for an injunction, and they obtained a temporary injunction, in order to delay the project further. The hearing was set for June 4 of this year. The Department appeared and said their lawyers had not had time to prepare briefs and had the hearing put off until September of this year. They have delayed the building of the dam for 2 years. In 2 years the dam could have been built and power could have been supplied to eastern North Carolina.

The Secretary of the Interior has announced that there is a shortage of power and that we must have more power. Nevertheless he has moved heaven and earth to keep the dam from being built. The Government has estimated that it would cost \$32,000,000 to build the dam. The power company was going to build it for \$28,000,000. They could have had the dam built and the power made available to the cooperatives and to all the people of eastern North Carolina but for the interference of the Department of the Interior.

The Richmond Times-Leader, reviewing the subject on May 10, 1951, said:

UNCONSCIONABLE DELAY AT ROANOKE RAPIDS

The petition brought by Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman, seeking a further delay in court consideration of the Roanoke Rapids case, walks on the edge of contempt. His blandly arrogant motion is aimed at postponing argument in the Roanoke Rapids case a full 4 months, from the June term of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in Asheville until the court's October term in Richmond. Those months would be irretrievably lost to the Virginia Electric & Power Co. in its long struggle to erect the proposed \$27,000,000 dam. If Mr. Chapman were sincerely interested in seeing the development of a water resource, he long ago would have joined the power company in its application; he would have encouraged an effort simultaneously to harness the Roanoke River and to preserve the private-enterprise system. Instead, Mr. Chapman has willfully adopted a campaign of harassment and delay, of objection and obstruction; he is out to save the South for socialized power, and no devious legal stratagem is beneath him.

Vepco filed its application for authority to build the dam on October 6, 1948. The Department of the Interior intervened the following January; for more than 2 years, Interior's attorneys have pursued a calculated plan to delay and delay and delay. After all evidence had been taken, in June 1950, the secretary conjured up some flimsy pretexts to reopen the case for further testimony; so further testimony was taken, and the case was stalled another 4 months, but the additional evidence added little, if anything, to the record. In January, the Power Commission decided every point in Vepco's favor. If the case is argued in June, Mr.

Chapman will have had nearly five full months to prepare his presentation. It is absurd to say that Interior's skilled attorneys need four more months to write a brief in a case in which they already have written two monumental briefs.

This may seem a small point—a minor legal proceeding of limited public interest—but Mr. Chapman's delaying tactics has a significance beyond the surface merits of this case. In this new obstruction, one finds one more clear and unmistakable sign of the Fair Deal's war against the private-power industry. The Secretary, a Halifax County Cato, is determined that every Carthage of private power must be destroyed; he has been remarkably successful elsewhere—notably in the Pacific Northwest—but Vepco has resisted stubbornly.

If Vepco can be defeated at Roanoke Rapids—let us make no mistake about it—the Nation's private-power industry is virtually done for. At issue in this case is the Fair Deal's distorted concept that the Federal Government may constitutionally erect pure-power projects and engage in the power business wholly apart from flood control or aid to navigation. The proposed dams at Roanoke Rapids and Gaston have nothing to do with flood control; they have nothing to do with navigation. They are pure power projects. Vepco should build these dams, and the sooner the better. Public acceptance of socialized power, in these parts, is still a long way off.

I have read this editorial to show the attitude of the Department of the Interior. It controls the Southeastern Power Administration. The Administration does not want to make the contracts. If it were left to them, they would make them. I say that the Congress should not give authority to make contracts for things which are not needed and for services which could and would be supplied at a much cheaper rate than would be obtainable if the Government were to build the lines.

I ask the Senate to consider the matter very seriously. I have no personal interest in the world in the subject. The lines are to be built in my State. We need more power in North Carolina. Our people cannot understand why, when we need more power, the Secretary of the Interior fights the building of the dam at Roanoke Rapids, which would supply the needed power, when at the same time the power companies who operate in that section are rendering magnificent service.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should very much appreciate it if the Senator would amplify one part of his remarks. I understood the Senator from North Carolina to say that in the case of various agencies at Goldsboro and at Wilson contracts have been entered into which were acceptable to the Southeastern Power Administration for the transmission of power from the Buggs Island development to the areas, and that a similar contract had been offered for the transmission from the same place to Kinston, N. C., but had been denied. Would the Senator amplify his statement in that regard?

Mr. HOEY. The Senator is correct, except in one respect. I did not say that the Southeastern Power Administration had approved the contract. I said it was

acceptable to the cooperatives at Wilson, and Rocky Mount, and that they had signed contracts. I did not say that the Southeastern Power Administration had approved them. I do not know whether they had. However, the power company is perfectly willing to make the same sort of contract at Kinston which they have made at the other places. As an indication of the attitude of the Southeastern Power Administration, when they talk about a contract they hand the company a paper with seven conditions written on it. They say to the company, "Here are seven things which you must agree to before we will even talk about a contract." That is an example of the arrogance with which the Administration approaches the subject. It is not a matter of one man talking with another man, of one American citizen discussing a subject with another American citizen, or of the Government dealing with one of its citizens. The Southeastern Power Administration says, "You do this. No argument about it. You sign your name." They want the Senate to give them a gun, so they can point it at a power company's head and say, "If you do not sign, we will pull the trigger." I am opposed to investing that sort of power in the Administration in its dealings with power companies.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOEY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not a fact that the contracts to which the Senator from North Carolina refers were made at Wilson, Rocky Mount, and Goldsboro only a few weeks ago, when it became apparent that the Congress would take action and approve the appropriation necessary to make survey and build power lines to service those communities?

Mr. HOEY. No; they were made after the House had already defeated the provision. Furthermore, I may say to the Senator from Louisiana, the same contracts had been offered all along. There is no trouble about making contracts. The companies have been serving Goldsboro for 40 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the contracts were entered into when efforts were made to obtain Congressional action with respect to the proposed contract at Kinston to which the Senator refers, is the Senator certain that a contract similar to the one offered at Wilson and Goldsboro has been offered at Kinston?

Mr. HOEY. The company is perfectly willing to do so.

Mr. ELLENDER. The record does not show that the company is willing to contract on the same basis.

Mr. HOEY. I do not know whether the contract had been actually offered. However, the company announced publicly that it would be glad to make that kind of contract. There is no difficulty about making a contract. The company wants to transmit the power. It has the lines running from Buggs Island to Kinston, through the towns which are already being served, where there would be no reason on earth to build another line.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator think it is a good policy for the Gov-

ernment to spend millions of dollars to build dams, such as at Buggs Island and Clark Hill, and then permit a private concern to be the sole distributor of the electricity produced at such facilities?

Mr. HOEY. Not at all, but if a private company is willing to wheel the power at a reasonable rate I cannot see any reason why it should not be permitted to do so.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean from the bus bar?

Mr. HOEY. Yes; that is what they are willing to do.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us consider Greenwood. We are now talking about Greenwood.

Mr. HOEY. From Clark Hill to Greenwood.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. As I understand, the Duke Power Co. wishes to furnish electricity at Greenwood.

Mr. HOEY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Unless we permit the Government to build lines from Clark Hill to Greenwood, and other points, does it not follow that private concerns will be the only ones to come to the bus bar and obtain the publicly generated electricity, and that it is therefore possible that the preferred customers will not be able to obtain it?

Mr. HOEY. Not at all. The Duke Power Co. has offered to wheel this power at 1 mill per kilowatt-hour, and let them send it wherever they wish to. The Duke Power Co. and the Carolina Electric & Gas Co. are willing to make the same sort of contract that the Georgia Power Co. made, and that the Southeastern Power Administration has approved.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the policy the Senator is now advocating is followed, the result in the case of Buggs Island and Clark Hill will be that the privately owned concerns will get the sole right to distribute the power, to the exclusion of those who are entitled to it, namely, the preferred customers.

Mr. HOEY. No; they would be delivering it to whomever they wish to; there is no trouble in regard to delivering it. They would offer to make a wheeling agreement to deliver the power. It is not that they wish to confiscate the power, because the Carolina Light & Power Co. has a lower rate than Buggs Island will have.

Mr. ELLENDER. The evidence shows, as I recall it, that the Carolina Power Co. has refused to contract with the cooperatives in the Kinston area. The reason why the committee decided to have a survey made in regard to that line was that it hoped that the same offer which was made and consummated at Rocky Mount and Wilson and Goldsboro would be made and undertaken at Kinston. The fact that there was no evidence to show that the power company had agreed to deal with Kinston in the way that it had with the three other localities I have just mentioned, was the reason that prompted the committee to include in the bill an item to provide funds with which to have the survey made.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will recall, L. V. Sutton, who ap-

peared before the committee, testified that they were ready at any time to make a contract. There is no question about that.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will note that one of these lines is entirely within South Carolina; I refer to the line which runs from Clark Hill to Greenwood, a distance of 41 miles. I wish to call attention to the further fact that no transmission line now runs where this proposed transmission line is to be built. I also call attention to the fact that the Government has spent millions of dollars in Greenwood County to build what is known as the Buzzard Roost development. When we finish the Clark Hill development, what we want there is a transmission line running from Clark Hill to Greenwood, so in case we have more electricity than we can use in Greenwood, it can be distributed down the line to Clark Hill. On the other hand, if there is a shortage of electricity at Buzzard Roost, then by means of the transmission line we can deliver the electricity to Greenwood. If we do not have that line, but have to depend on the private lines, we shall be charged twice—both going and coming, so to speak—for the transmission, under the wheeling agreements and one thing and another.

Mr. President, in fairness to the power companies, I wish to say that they have done a good job in South Carolina, as far as they have gone. However, until we had in South Carolina a development financed by the Federal Government, known as the Santee-Cooper project, as it is generally referred to in South Carolina, we could not obtain results. But since we have had the Santee-Cooper project, which we could use as a whip over the private power companies, we have gotten more done by the power companies in my State.

I wish to commend the committee for what it has done in the past toward having the power companies enter into the agreements by saying to them, in effect "If you enter into the agreement, we will not build a transmission line." In effect, the committee says that in this bill.

What harm will be done if the Government subsequently builds a transmission line, or even if it builds a transmission line now? The private power companies certainly can build a transmission line before the Government builds one. Thus far, the private companies have not built a transmission line there. Power cannot be transmitted there until the line is built.

This committee amendment is merely a little encouragement to the private power companies to do what we would like to have them do in connection with this matter. I believe this appropriation will not have to be spent if we provide for it in the terms in which it is now provided for in the bill; but the amendment will have a great influence in getting the private power companies to enter into contracts suitable for carrying the electric power or wheeling it to the people, and in getting the power companies to

look out for the interests of the people of my State.

Let us bear in mind that from Clark Hill to Greenwood its entirely in South Carolina. I am not referring at this time to North Carolina. I wish the Senator from North Carolina would confine his recommendations regarding the committee amendment to North Carolina, instead of applying them to both North Carolina and South Carolina, for I know what is needed in my State, and I believe I know what would be for the best interests of the power companies and for the Government-owned power lines.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the Department of the Interior has entered into approximately 125 wheeling contracts, and that in almost every case there has been no contract until the Congress has provided in the bill for the building of the line in the event the wheeling contract is not made?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I agree with everything the Senator from Alabama has said. The committee amendment is included in the bill only for the purpose of encouraging the private power companies to do the work and to receive the benefits therefrom.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the committee amendment. I am sorry that my colleague is not here today. Of course, I cannot speak for him. I imagine that the chairman of the committee knows his position in regard to this matter. However, I know what my colleague's position has been in the past in connection with matters of this kind.

We only wish to do what is fair and what is right for both the power companies and the Government-owned companies, and we must also keep in mind the interests of the public at large.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I do not think it is necessary for the colleague of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina to be here, for the Senator from South Carolina seems to be taking very good care of the people of South Carolina, as he usually does. Certainly he is taking good care of his constituents.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator how much the appropriation amounts to, in the case of South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It amounts to \$318,500; I think that is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama that the so-called wheeling contract covered by the Keating amendment in the House of Representatives would put out of business eight of the REA cooperatives in North Dakota, if the Keating amendment were adopted by the Senate. So I

am delighted with the action of the committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has well and ably presented the case for the appropriation of funds provided in the committee amendment for the transmission line from Clark Hill to the Greenwood County Co-operative Association in the event no wheeling contract is entered into.

In this connection, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Senate Committee on Appropriations in reporting the bill to the Senate has, in its report on the bill, directed the Secretary of the Interior to make every possible effort to obtain a wheeling contract. As I said in the course of my query addressed to the Senator from South Carolina that is the way we have gotten wheeling contracts, namely, by including such funds in the bill. Until the funds are provided in the bill, so that the Department of the Interior is able to proceed to build a transmission line if need be, wheeling contracts are not entered into. That is the whole history of the matter of wheeling contracts and transmission lines, as the distinguished Senator from South Carolina and the distinguished Senator from Arizona have so well stated.

As to the provision with reference to the power from Buggs Island to Kinston, N. C., let me say that all the committee amendment provides is approximately \$23,000 for a survey, but not a penny or nickel is provided by the committee amendment for the building of a transmission line from the Buggs Island project to Kinston. All that the committee amendment provides for is a survey. It would be impossible to build the line without first coming to the Congress and getting an appropriation for that specific purpose.

There is no Senator for whom I have higher regard or greater esteem than the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOBY]. I think he knows of the esteem in which I hold him. I am a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations which considered this matter, and I am afraid that the Senator from North Carolina simply has not had called to his attention all the facts in the matter. I should like to call his attention to testimony to be found in the hearings, at page 939, of Mr. L. P. Beverage, the manager of the Four Counties Electric Membership Corp., of Burgaw, N. C. He appeared before the subcommittee. He did not request a survey, such as the one the committee provided. He requested money for the purpose of building the line. Speaking for the REA co-ops in that section of North Carolina, Mr. Beverage said:

For the past 3 years we have been working on a program, and at the first of our program we organized what we called an Electric Membership Corp., of which I am president, to work out something to get a more dependable power supply for eastern North Carolina at a reasonable cost.

He then said:

Our studies that we have been making indicate that our most feasible feeder point

would be to come into Kinston, where the Southeastern has proposed to build a line to, and we have repeatedly tried to work out something with the power company since January of 1950.

I have been reading from the testimony of Mr. Beverage, who was speaking on behalf of the REA co-ops in that section of North Carolina. I repeat what he said:

We have repeatedly tried to work out something with the power company since January of 1950.

He continued:

The original proposal was to wheel Buggs Island power, but they added a restriction to this clause that they proposed to give us that would almost prohibit us from realizing the benefits of the low-cost power at Buggs Island. Since that time we have negotiated with them on several occasions to try to work out something. In October 1950, we asked them to give us a little more reasonable contract and stated the terms that we would like to have, and they said, "Oh, no, we cannot do that. You would have to become customers of the company and let us buy the power at Buggs Island and resell it to you."

Mr. President, that is the nub of the thing. The question is whether this power is to be bought at the bus bar by the private power company, in turn to be sold by it to the REA co-ops, in the same manner in which they sell to any other customer desiring to purchase power; or whether we shall carry out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, which provided that REA's and public bodies should get the power at the lowest cost consistent with sound business principles, which means, as the law prescribes, that there shall be a sufficient income to pay the cost of the Government project.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to my friend from North Carolina.

Mr. HOEY. The testimony to which the Senator has been referring relates to power to be furnished by the Tidewater Power Co. It is a very high rate, and I referred to that. As late as January 1950 the other companies got together and proposed a contract which would have called for a reduced rate, which would have saved the cooperatives \$25,000 a month. That contract has not been approved.

Mr. HILL. I intend to come to that in a very few moments. They got along as they did in 1938, when they first received a very low rate, which was later increased so that they are now paying 1½ cents for power. I am coming to that.

Mr. HOEY. Had they been given the reduced rate, which the company had agreed to give them, it would have saved them, up to this time, over \$300,000.

Mr. HILL. I am coming to that. Mr. Beverage, in his testimony, speaks of that very proposition. Reading further, from page 940, Mr. Beverage said:

And we are paying at the present time 1½ cents per kilowatt-hour.

Any Senator who has gone into the matter of rates knows that 1½ cents

per kilowatt-hour is a very high rate.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HOEY. This contract would have brought it down to practically half that amount, would it not?

Mr. HILL. Yes, and in a few moments I shall come to that very point.

Then Mr. Beverage goes on to say that, because of the high rate, it has not been possible to develop the REA co-ops and to develop the use of power as should have done, and as the development of North Carolina and of the country as a whole dictates should be done. He brings out the fact that this high rate, as the Senator from North Carolina has suggested, is the rate of the Tidewater Power Co., which is now furnishing the power; and he further develops that the Tidewater Power Co. buys most of its power from the Carolina Power & Light Co. He states that the Tidewater Power Co. buys from Carolina Power & Light Co., and that they have never been able to understand why the Carolina Power & Light Co. would not sell to the REA co-ops directly, instead of making them buy from the Tidewater Power Co., that company buying in turn from the Carolina Power & Light Co.

Reading further, from page 941, Mr. Beverage said:

There is a funny thing on that resale proposition that we have never been able to figure out. We have a substation located approximately 6 miles from the C. P. & L. system where they sell to Tidewater Power Co. Tidewater charges us 1½ cents, and 6 miles up the road C. P. & L. is selling it for 7½ mills.

We never have been able to figure out why C. P. & L. has repeatedly just evaded the issue when we approached them about purchasing the power.

He further said:

We have been planning in our last talks with the power company—we asked them what we could do to take advantage of this cheaper rate of 12½ mills, approximately, and they told us that the only way that they saw that we could do it at that time would be to build a transmission system of our power which would consolidate all of our load into one metering point, and through that we would be able to buy on a 1,000-kilowatt-rate schedule.

I invite particular attention to this:

But when we first organized our cooperative in North Carolina in 1937 we couldn't get any agreement with the power companies at all to sell our cooperative power at a reasonable cost.

Our engineers came up with the idea of building our own hydro plant on a river which was located within the area of the cooperative, and we had made application for funds to REA to build that hydro project.

Immediately after the plans were submitted to REA the power company came back and were glad to deal with us if we were going to put in our own power system.

In other words, when the power company saw that the cooperative meant business, and that they were going to put in their own power system, rather than pay the high rates demanded by the power company, then the company became ready to do business. Mr. Beverage continues:

They came down to a point where we could afford to buy power from them, which was around 1 cent at that time.

The contract at that time was for 1 cent. He continued:

Since 1938—

That is when all of this happened—

Since 1938 through what they call a fuel charge they have been gradually increasing our rate to a point now where it has gone up from 1 cent to a little over 1½ cents.

When we organized our eastern group and asked the power companies to make a counterproposal to give us dependable service at a reasonable cost to avoid having to build a transmission system of our own, they came back with a somewhat similar proposal to that which they gave us in 1938 of 8½ mills, and we build our own load centers.

And we look upon it somewhat as exactly what to do. Our board saw practically the same thing happen in 1938. Are we going to be faced with the same thing 10 years from now? We are going to be back to the 1½-cent power.

We know that if the power company makes an offer today it can raise the rate tomorrow, unless there be a wheeling contract which stipulates a reasonable rate to the farmers and insures their continuing to receive power at a reasonable rate.

The witness went on to say that there were 7,400 members of his particular cooperative, and that the eastern group represented 49,000 members. I take it he means 49,500 families altogether.

In connection with the proposition as to whether the company has made any real proposal, let us take a look at the record with reference to wheeling the power. I wish to read from page 1022, from the testimony of Mr. L. V. Sutton, the president of the Carolina Power & Light Co. I read from page 1022:

Senator HAYDEN. What is the difference between your situation and that in Oklahoma or Arkansas or southern Missouri and other places, or in the far West, wherein the private power companies have found it to their advantage to agree that they will help to carry out the public-power policy of the Government; that is, to make available any power generated at these hydroelectric dams to preferred customers of the Government, the co-ops, the municipalities, or to the Government itself, at the lowest possible rates consistent with good business principles? They have agreed in these wheeling agreements to do that very thing and have found it advantageous to do it, because, by integrating the hydro power with their steam power, they save money on steam generation. You say this high-cost coal is involved. It would certainly be possible to integrate the Buggs Island power, fluctuating as it is, into your system in an advantageous way; is that not true?

Does Mr. Sutton say, "We have made an offer to do that very thing"? Does he say, "We have offered a wheeling contract to the Southeastern Power Association"? Does he say, "Here is your contract; we are ready to sign it"? Does he say, "I have already signed it; have Mr. Chapman, the Secretary of the Interior, sign it"? No. What does he say? He says, "I think that could be worked out." Could there be any better evidence, in fact, that he has not offered such a wheeling contract? He said, "I think that could be worked out." Then

the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] said:

Then, if you can do it, as in the West, it is simply a question of how much you should be paid for wheeling it from Buggs Island to these preferred customers of the Government. What is your objection to doing that?

Mr. Sutton replied:

We will be glad to work out something of that kind.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Alabama, in reading from the testimony, quoted a reference to high-priced coal. I assume that high-priced coal is affected by the escalator clause which is added to some of the wholesale contracts. Does the Senator from Alabama know whether in this case the fuel charge may be based upon high-priced coal, or whether the power is generated by means of offshore, low-cost oil, as is done in many generating plants along the Atlantic coast?

Mr. HILL. I could not tell the Senator. I do not know whence comes the coal.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it would be well for the smaller companies, the cooperatives and municipalities, that purchase wholesale power, where there is an escalator clause in the contract based on the cost of fuel, to investigate and find out whether they are being charged on the basis of high-cost coal, whereas low-cost offshore oil may actually be used.

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator has made a very wholesome suggestion.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HOEY. I will say, in response to the question of the Senator from Vermont, that ordinarily the price is based not on an escalator clause, but on one mill or half a mill per kilowatt hour for the transmission of power for 50 miles and another half-mill for another 50 miles. It is based on the lowest possible cost.

Mr. AIKEN. In this case does the utility company actually transmit power to be used at so much a kilowatt-hour, or does it buy it and resell it to the customer?

Mr. HOEY. It transmits it either way. In one instance, they buy it, and if they want to transmit it, they wheel it.

Further on in Mr. Sutton's testimony, he mentioned the fact that in submitting contracts to cooperatives, he put in wheeling agreements, but they said, "We do not want that; we want a delivered price." They asked him to eliminate it.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to my distinguished friend that on page 1024 of the hearings the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] asked some questions. One of the questions was:

Have you presented such contracts to the Southeastern Power Administration? That is, wheeling contracts—

Mr. SUTTON. No, I would like to tell you why—

Senator O'MAHONEY. Are you willing to present such a contract?

Mr. SUTTON. Yes.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Have you discussed it with the Administration?

Mr. SUTTON. To some extent. Then relations were broken off. I would like to put in the record why.

They gave us a manifesto.

Senator O'MAHONEY. That is a bad word to use.

Mr. SUTTON. I know no other word to express it. I picked that word as the best word I could use covering this.

They handed us a proposed basis for contractual agreements between the Southeastern Power Administration and the private power companies. In other words, before they would talk, we would have to agree to all these things.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I never knew a proposal to be a definitive contract, sir.

We find ourselves, Mr. President, in the position of having the Senate Committee on Appropriations bringing before us a bill with an appropriation providing for only a survey of this line, and directing the Secretary of the Interior to use every power at his command to work out a wheeling contract. We find, according to M. Sutton's own testimony, that he has never made any real bona fide offer of a wheeling contract.

So far as the proposal coming to the Southeastern Power Administration is concerned, of course any proposal for the making of any contract is subject to change and modification. We usually take the best offer we think it is possible to get, with the idea that we can change it, modify it, or give something. That is the situation. If we place the little sum of \$23,000 in the bill we will get a wheeling contract and the people and the farmers of North Carolina will get the benefit of the dam which they have been promised by the Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1944. They will receive the same treatment in the matter of power that many REA communities and municipalities are receiving. Otherwise, they will be denied the cheap power which is being furnished to other municipalities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, beginning in line 5.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to my very good friend, the senior Senator from North Carolina, that he withdraw his request for a vote on this question. I make that suggestion in all good faith. As he knows, we have on previous occasions, by following a similar procedure, brought about a meeting of the minds between the Federal authorities and the private power companies.

As the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has just pointed out, so far as his own State is concerned, we have merely provided for a survey—that is all. The situation in eastern North Carolina, as disclosed by the hearings, is that they are not served by the principal power companies of the State, either by the Virginia Power Co. or the Carolina Power Co., but by a subsidiary power company, which produces no power, but buys it from some other company. Certainly the main companies in that area ought to be able to take care of that business themselves. If they do that, and not act through a subsidiary, the rate can be cut in half, as the Senator himself has suggested; instead of one

and a half cents it could be seven and a half mills. That can be done. I think that is the way to go about it.

If the language is entirely stricken out of the bill it will be a clear indication to the power company that the Congress does not intend to appropriate any money in that area to build any transmission lines, and that the sole recourse the preferred customers of the Government have is to make some kind of an arrangement with the private power company, and that, of course, gives the private company the very best side of the bargain.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. What it means is this: The power is available; the water going over the dam to waste. Power is being generated, with one customer, that is the private power company. They come to the dam, to the bus bar, and the Government is in such a position that it is forced to sell to them for whatever it can get for the power. Furthermore, as the Senator so well knows, it is absolutely to the interest of the Government to be able, if necessary, to build a line so as to tie its power in with other power, because by so doing the secondary, or peak, or what we call dump power, can be firmed up through a mutual arrangement, and thereby be made more valuable to the Government, bringing to the Federal Treasury much more money, and contributing more to pay off the cost of the project to the taxpayers of the United States. Is that not true?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. That is exactly what was done in Oklahoma, to the mutual advantage of the Government and the private power company. Both of them made money by such an arrangement. The same thing can be done in this instance. I am just as well satisfied as I am that I am standing here, that if we had not appropriated the money to build the transmission line from Buggs Island to Langley Field there would today be no low-cost power delivered by the Virginia Power Co. to Langley Field. When the House first indicated that it would act on that appropriation the company came forward with a more favorable offer, and when we actually appropriated the money, they made a still more favorable offer. That shows that they can make money delivering the power to that area.

We want to see the Carolina Power Co. make money. I have indicated always that I favor a policy of "live and let live"; but there must be some bargaining.

So I suggest that the Senator permit this situation to continue for another year to see how it comes out. Unless we put in the bill this language in an effort to bring about a wheeling contract, we are making no effort whatever toward getting this benefit to the farmers of that section of North Carolina. I know that my friend from North Carolina is anxious and eager to do all he can to bring to the people of this area the benefits of this power at the low rates provided for in the Flood Control Act of 1944, to obtain for them the same benefits which

many farmers and many co-ops are getting throughout the United States from Government-built projects.

I can understand the Senator's concern about the situation in his own State. But so far as the State of South Carolina is concerned we have one of the Senators from that State with us upon the floor. The other Senator [Mr. MAYBANK], as a member of the committee and the junior Senator from South Carolina both agree that it is advisable to appropriate money for the transmission line from Clark Hill to Greenwood. They believe that if that appropriation is made a proper wheeling contract will be entered into with the private utilities in that area.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to say to the Senator from Arizona that since I spoke on the floor a few minutes ago the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] called me and said just what he had previously said in reference to his position on this particular amendment; that he thought that the language should be adopted in the form reported by the committee, of which he is a member.

Mr. HAYDEN. Those, Mr. President, are the representations I wanted to make. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Arizona that I am fully in accord with his views about this matter. I would have not the slightest question about it at all if his committee were going to pass on it. I want to say very definitely that I am very strongly in favor of providing the lowest possible rate for the cooperatives in North Carolina as well as the other States.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator said, "If the committee were going to pass on it."

Mr. HOEY. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is exactly what the committee does. An appropriation for a survey would have to be followed up by an appropriation for a transmission line. That is when the committee passes on it. The appropriation will be made for the southeastern area as the appropriation was made for Colorado, as the appropriation was made in Montana, as the appropriation was made in California. They were all made with this understanding. When the wheeling agreements were made the money was withdrawn, just as we have made the rescission in the very next paragraph with reference to the Virginia Power Co. conveying power to Langley Field.

The committee played fair, and it will continue to play fair if there is proper agreement made and a real sincere effort to trade. When people want to trade they can trade. When they do not want to, and feel that they do not have to, that is another situation. The Senator can trust the Senate Committee on Appropriations. We will not make appropriations arbitrarily to carry out any kind of an arrangement if we find that the Government is trying to take an unfair advantage of the Senator's constituents who are in the private power busi-

ness. On the other hand we want to be sure that both sides are on the up and up, each trying to do its best for one another.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am just wondering about these wheeling agreements, which I assume are made more or less to extend over most of the country. Assuming that a wheeling agreement is made with a private power company to carry the power from a publicly owned dam, and that it is on a perfectly satisfactory basis, for a 5-year period or a 10-year period; what happens when that contract expires? The company has the only high-tension line going to the dam. Most States have public service commissions which would prohibit anybody else from building lines to that dam. What is going to happen then when those contracts expire? Are not the private companies going to be virtually the only purchasers or carriers of that power?

Mr. HAYDEN. So long as it is to their advantage to take unfirm hydro power and consolidate it with the steam power that is the situation throughout practically all parts of the United States. It is to their advantage to plan the two together. If they could not get the hydro the Government had they would have to build stand-by steam plants, which it would not pay them to do. On the other hand, the power the Government has, which is unfirm, is firmed up by these contracts, so that the Government naturally has more power to sell to its preferred customers. It is a mutually advantageous arrangement, and there is no reason for breaking it at the end of 5 years or any other time. All these contracts, I may say to the Senator, contain a provision that they may be revised upward or downward on a year's notice after a period of 3 years. Either party can do that.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is highly correct, that it would be to the mutual advantage of both the cooperatives, if they are using the power, or part of it, and the private companies, to continue with a satisfactory arrangement. But I am wondering what will happen at the end of the 3-year agreement, when the power company has the only line going to this great source of power. I am particularly concerned because of the matter which the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] is discussing today. I do not know the local situation which relates to this particular case. I think this matter is only one phase of the conflict between the private power companies, on the one hand, and the municipalities, the public power districts, and the REA, on the other.

We know that the aim of the private companies is not to prevent the expenditure of Federal funds in developing electrical energy, but to make sure that they have a complete monopoly over such energy once it is developed. I am fully satisfied as to that. The Senator knows, for example, how hard I have worked

for the development of the St. Lawrence seaway. The Senator also knows of the intense opposition which that project has encountered from the utility companies, using the railroads as a front, largely—including the Senator's own railroad, the Santa Fe, which is apparently acting as "hatchet man" for the utility companies at this stage of the game. A few years ago the president of one of New England's larger power companies wrote to me—he did not telephone—that if the proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway would agree to sell all the power to the utility company at the bus bar, not letting the municipalities or the cooperatives have any except what they purchased from the power company, they would not only withdraw their opposition to the St. Lawrence development, but they would get behind it and help us to put it over.

That is why I know that all this is simply one phase of the conflict by which the private utility companies are now undertaking to obtain control of all the power generated at publicly constructed and owned dams. I cannot draw any other conclusion from these operations.

What concerns me is this: Once they get a line into this source of power, can anyone else ever put a line in there? The Congress might vote to construct a public line when it would not vote to confiscate a line which was already there and privately owned. I am simply raising the question now because we may have to face it later. I will vote for the committee amendment at this time, but I do not think that settles the problem.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me say to the Senator from Vermont that I think he is borrowing trouble by anticipating what will happen some 5 or 10 years from now in the event that a satisfactory wheeling arrangement having been made, and the contract having expired, the private power company might say, "Since we have the only high tension transmission line to carry this power, we will not enter into any further agreement, but we will proceed to charge the preferred customers of the Government more money for carrying the power than we have charged them heretofore."

In the first place, the power companies would certainly be under some regulation by the State utilities commission, or whatever the regulating authority may be. In the second place, if they could get away with it, is there any doubt in the mind of anyone that Congress would say, "That being the case, we shall simply have to parallel your line, and see that the preferred customers get their power."

When the power companies found that to be the situation, they would again come forward and make a decent wheeling agreement, just as we ask them to do now.

Let me mention one basic fact. We know that the investment in the generation and transmission of power by the Federal Government at the present time is about \$2,000,000,000. We know that the investment by the private utilities of the United States in generation and transmission of electric power is about \$22,000,000,000. So when anyone entertains the idea, first, that it is possible to

socialize public power throughout the United States, all he has to do is to stop and think what chance there would be of getting an appropriation of \$22,000,000,000 from any American Congress now in existence or in prospect. So that question is out of the way.

The cry of socialism has been raised by many of the private utilities. In my mind it is utterly unjustified. No member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations that I know of, or that I have known since I have anything to do with it, is a Socialist. All we are trying to do is to carry out a policy laid down by Congress in the Flood Control Act, which states that public power shall be made available to preferred customers at the lowest possible rates consistent with good business judgment. If that objective cannot be attained by making wheeling agreements with the private utilities, then the Government itself will have to take appropriate action.

Every member of the committee prefers to see private industry do this work where it can be done fairly and equitably; and we find that wherever it is done, it is to the mutual advantage of the Government and the private utilities.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HOEY. I should like to say, in response to what the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] has said, that the companies would like to have longer contracts than 3 years. The Government does not want to make a contract for longer than 3 years. I do not believe that that phase need concern us.

I believe that what the Senator from Arizona says is absolutely true in that respect. The limitation of 3 years on a contract is a provision which the Government inserts.

Mr. HAYDEN. There are contracts for 5 years, and longer. They are subject to revision—

Mr. HOEY. At the expiration of 3 years.

Mr. HAYDEN. No. They are subject to revision on a year's notice, beginning 3 years after the contract is written.

Mr. HOEY. That is correct. However, that provision is ordinarily inserted at the instance of the Government, and not the power company.

I appreciate very much the assurance which the Senator from Arizona gives with reference to what his committee will do in supervising the matter.

With reference to the line with respect to which provision is made for a survey to Kinston, that subject, of course, would come back for further attention by the committee. However, in the case of the appropriation for the line from Clark Hill to Greenwood, the proposed appropriation is \$323,000, which would represent a part of the cost of building the line. I wonder if the Senator and his committee would have any supervision before the building began, or whether the appropriation would be made available so that the Administration could begin to construct the line whenever it got ready.

Mr. HAYDEN. This appropriation is to commence construction. It will not finish it. The cost of the entire construction will be approximately \$1,500,000.

Mr. HOEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Administration would have to come to Congress to get more money. When it did so, we would be able to inquire whether or not a wheeling agreement had been made.

Mr. HOEY. After having spent \$323,000, which they would probably do unless they exercised some restraint, they could come to Congress and say, "We have already invested \$323,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. They could say that, but they would have to say it in the face of the directive which the committee has written into its report. They would have to say that they had tried and found it impossible to make a wheeling agreement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I sought to interrupt because I think I may have an answer for the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Hoey].

The Senator from Arizona will recall that the Committee on Rules and Administration has twice approved a resolution from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which is presently conducting a study of energy resources in the United States. It covers not only coal, petroleum, and natural gas, but also hydroelectric power. The members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs feel that the study should also attempt to bring about an understanding with respect to the cooperative operations of public and private power.

Evidence which I have seen brought before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and also as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, is clear that there is much more demand for electrical energy than we are supplying. I believe it would very much against the public interest if, because of controversy between public and private power, we should stop the construction, generation, and transmission of electric energy. I can say to the Senator from North Carolina that we are going into the matter fully, completely, and objectively. I believe there is no need for any continuing controversy between public power and private power. We need both sources. The work will be done.

Mr. HOEY. I thank the Senator from Wyoming. In conclusion I wish to say that I have a tremendous interest in the cooperatives in my State. When I was Governor of North Carolina we extended the rural lines and brought power to many farmers who had never had it. The power companies have cooperated. We had no difficulty except for some higher rates which were charged by the smaller companies in the eastern part of the State. For instance, the Carolina Light & Power Co. is delivering power at a cheaper rate than they can get at Buggs Island. It is cheaper than if the Government were to build the lines. Farmers are getting

power cheaper than if the Government built the lines and carried the power from Buggs Island.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. My memory of the testimony is that a representative of the cooperatives in the Kinston area testified that his group purchased power from a small local electrical utility—Tidewater Electric, or some such name—

Mr. HOEY. The Tidewater Power Co.

Mr. CORDON. They purchased it from the Tidewater Power Co. He testified that the rate averaged a cent and a half per kilowatt. He called attention to a situation which he said existed, namely, that the Carolina Power Co., which sells power to the Tidewater Power Co. for its retail purposes, also sells to other cooperatives, and that within a very short distance of the point where the witness' cooperative took its power from the Tidewater Co., other cooperatives took power from the Carolina Power Co. for 7½ mills per kilowatt instead of the cent and a half rate which those taking power from the Tidewater Co. had to pay. He said the reason was that the Tidewater Power Co. did not have adequate generating facilities. If I remember, he said they had one or two old steam plants, which were used more or less for stand-by purposes.

Furthermore, he said that the Tidewater Co. bought all of their power from the Carolina Co., and that they were not properly equipped to transmit power. As a result the Kinston group was discriminated against to an extent of substantially 100 percent in their cost of power.

It was that situation, appearing in the record, which led me to the view that it was time that some action should be taken to correct the inequity, which was purely local, but still a very definite inequity in the Kinston area. My memory also is that representatives of the Carolina Power Co. intimated, without confessing the fact, that the situation referred to did exist there and that they were in an anomalous position, because while they were willing to furnish power at 7½ mills per kilowatt, it was in the area of a competing colleague—if one may use that term—and they, therefore, felt they should not do it. If that situation does exist, something is needed to correct it. Is the Senator aware of the situation?

Mr. HOEY. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that I mentioned the situation before he came into the Chamber. However, it is not due to the fact that Tidewater buys its power from Carolina Light & Power Co., but is due to the fact that it does not have adequate facilities to provide the power. It is a small company. It is a situation of great discrimination. That is why the Carolina Power Co., the Virginia Light & Power Co., and others got together in an attempt to furnish power sold at that rate. They formulated a contract for that purpose. As far back as January 1950 they laid such a contract on the table of the electric cooperatives in that section who had been discriminated against. The contract had to be signed by Mr. Wickard, the head of

the REA. It has been lying on his desk for a year. It has cost the cooperatives \$25,000 a month more in rates than they would have had to pay if that contract had been signed.

Mr. CORDON. I do not recall such testimony. It may be in the record.

Mr. HOEY. The testimony is in the record. That condition exists.

Mr. President, recurring to the proposition which I started to discuss a while ago, I realize that a bad condition exists. The Tidewater rates have been expensive in that particular area. However, I call attention to the fact that if a transmission line is built to Kinston, it would not serve the other places which have been mentioned, where the same rate must be paid. Other lines would have to be built, unless a power company was willing to transmit the power.

Mr. CORDON. That is to be expected. It would all have to be integrated.

Mr. HOEY. I have a tremendous interest in the farmers of my State. They should be properly served. The course I am pursuing is to their best interest. I wish to say that in every part of my State we have tried to develop rural electric lines. We favored the cooperative set-up. The power companies have cooperated. Each of the power companies has a large number of rural customers.

I wish to say that my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] joins with me in the position I am taking. We have gone into the subject fully. We believe it is the best course to pursue. If I could be assured that the Senator from Arizona and his committee would have the power to see to it that a reasonable contract would be submitted by the Southeastern Power Administration I would have no further concern about it, and I would be willing to risk their determination of the matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOEY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. In order to demonstrate to my good friend from North Carolina that the committee is ever mindful of the rights of privately owned institutions, I should like to point out that last year the committee recommended almost \$3,000,000 for the building of connecting lines in the western Missouri project. Congress agreed to the proposal. This year the House added to its appropriation \$1,560,600, in order to do further work on that project. However, there was evidence to show that the local privately owned concern offered a wheeling contract along the same provisions as contained in the Oklahoma contract and that the Southwestern Power Authority refused to enter into the contract. When that fact became known to the committee it revoked the \$1,560,600 recommendation of the House. In addition the committee added a provision in its report to the Senate with respect to an unexpended balance amounting to about \$1,300,000 that it should not be expended if it could be shown that the privately owned utility in that area is willing to enter into a wheeling contract as indicated.

Mr. HOEY. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator need not worry about it. The committee has taken cognizance of the fact. If it can be shown that the Carolina Power Co. is willing to enter into a wheeling contract the money will not be spent for the construction of a power line, nor will a survey be made as suggested.

Mr. HOEY. I appreciate the Senator's attitude. As I said, I have full confidence in the committee. I do not expect to have a yea-and-nay vote on the subject. My interest lies in everyone concerned with the matter, not necessarily with the power companies, although I believe they have done a magnificent job. My interest is for all concerned. I will not ask for a record vote.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I regret that we are unable to consider separately the two problems involved in this amendment, which relates both to an appropriation for the construction of a transmission line from Clark Hill to Greenwood and the matter of engineering on an altogether separate and different line. Certainly it is difficult to use with reference to one the same argument that is used with reference to the other, or perhaps, to take action in the case of one in the same way that we might desire to act with reference to the other.

In connection with this matter, I have received three telegrams which are somewhat surprising to me, and I do not understand why they were sent to me unless they were sent to all other members of the committee, as well. One of them comes from H. B. Gantt, president of Local Union No. 1879, International Association of Machinists, at Columbia, S. C. The telegram reads as follows:

COLUMBIA, S. C., July 7, 1951.

Hon. GUY CORDON,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Interior Department appropriations contain money for Southeastern Power Administration transmission lines in South Carolina for Clark Hill to Greenwood. These lines will be waste of money, manpower, and material as power can be transmitted cheaper over existing facilities. Government agencies, invasion into private industry endangers union bargaining rights. Urge you support motion to strike these funds from bill and save taxpayers needless waste of money.

H. B. GANTT,

President, Local Union No. 1879, International Association of Machinists.

Substantially the same sentiment is expressed in another telegram, which comes to me from T. W. H. Davis, president of the Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, Division No. 1337; and I have also received another telegram, to the same tenor, signed by M. Ellis George, president of Local Union No. 772, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; and J. C. Lanier, business manager of Local Union No. 398, of Charleston, S. C. I ask unanimous consent that the last-mentioned two telegrams may also appear in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLUMBIA, S. C., July 6, 1951.

Senator GUY CORDON,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Interior Department appropriation bill contains funds to build transmission lines from Clark Hill to Greenwood, S. C., existing lines can satisfactorily move this power without wasting millions of tax money and helping Interior's encroachment on private enterprise endangering bargaining rights of thousands of organized employees. Would appreciate your support of motion to take this money out of the bill.

T. W. H. DAVIS,

President, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, Division No. 1337.

COLUMBIA, S. C., July 7, 1951.

Senator GUY CORDON,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Ask you support motion strike from Interior Department appropriations bills funds to build transmission lines Clark Hill to Greenwood. This power can be moved over existing lines cheaper and better. Interior Department in such needless cases of invasion of private industry endangers job rights of hundreds of thousands of union workers and wastes millions of tax money.

M. ELLIS GEORGE,

President, Local Union No. 772, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

J. C. LANIER,

Business Manager, Local Union No. 398, Charleston, S. C.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CASE. I understand that the pending question is on the adoption of the committee amendment on page 2, in lines 5 to 11, inclusive, to provide \$342,020 for construction and acquisition of transmission lines.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. Is there any connection between the proposal for the appropriation of those funds and the paragraph immediately following, which would rescind the sum of \$1,758,400, the unobligated portion of a previous appropriation of \$1,850,000?

Mr. CORDON. There is none whatever.

Mr. CASE. There is no connection between the two?

Mr. CORDON. None whatever. The fact is that the appropriation to be rescinded was to be administered by the Southeastern Power Administration, and the appropriation proposed to be made at this time is to be made for administration by the same agency. Otherwise, there is no connection between the two.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, generally speaking, I have opposed appropriations by the Government for the construction of transmission lines in locations where the Government could obtain from an existing private utility a contract whereby the Federal power could be wheeled to preferred customers of the Government, including the Government itself, at reasonable rates.

In this instance, I am constrained to vote with the committee. I shall do so chiefly because I believe the situation is one which needs perhaps a bit of whiplash. I say very frankly that I was not satisfied with the testimony of Mr. Sutton, who appeared for the Carolina Power Co. at the committee hearings. I believe that the enactment of this bill with this particular item included in it will be salutary. I think we can rest reasonably assured that there will be no expenditures of these funds until the Senate Appropriations Committee and the House Appropriations Committee have been advised that there is no chance of securing a reasonable contract for wheeling with the companies which now have transmission facilities in the area.

I do not agree with those who say that the Government should use such an appropriation as a whip to require the signing of such an agreement as the Government desires. It should be used only to induce the making of the kind of reasonable agreement which protects the equities of both sides.

In this instance the testimony indicated to me that, more than in most cases with which I am familiar, this would be a salutary operation; and I shall support the committee in this instance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, in lines 5 to 11, inclusive. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment previously passed over will be stated.

The next amendment previously passed over was, on page 2, after line 11, to insert:

The sum of \$1,758,400, the unobligated portion of the \$1,850,000 appropriation contained in chapter V of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 911, 81st Cong.), under the heading "Department of the Interior, Southeastern Power Administration, construction," is hereby rescinded and shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment will be—

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask several questions of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

I understand that this provision rescinds \$1,758,400 of an appropriation previously made to build a transmission line from Buggs Island to Langley Field, Va. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. I further understand that the reason for the proposed rescission is that a contract has been signed between the Buggs Island authority and the private power company to deliver the power to Langley Field. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. The National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics has signed a contract for the delivery of power, and that contract is very much more favorable to the Government than the previous contract which the Vir-

ginia Power Co. had with the Federal agency for the delivery of power.

Mr. HILL. Does the power come from the Virginia Power Co.'s system, and is it other than power from the Buggs Island project?

Mr. HAYDEN. At the present time that is true.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

Mr. HAYDEN. We are hopeful that by the time the Buggs Island project is finished, there will be a suitable wheeling agreement to carry, not this particular power, but power from Buggs Island REA's in Virginia into the territory served by that company. That is what we desire.

Mr. HILL. I wonder whether the Senator from Arizona, as chairman of the subcommittee, will be willing to request the Civil Aeronautics Authority, the Government agency, to provide him with a copy of the contract.

Mr. HAYDEN. As I recall, it was submitted. Let me ask the Senator from Oregon about that.

Mr. CORDON. I do not recall that a copy of the contract last signed went into the Record.

Mr. HAYDEN. At any rate, the Secretary of the Interior said that under those circumstances he did not ask that any appropriation for this purpose be made, and he recommended that this rescission be made.

Mr. HILL. I understand that there is no objection on the part of the chairman of the subcommittee to requesting the authorities to provide a copy of the contract, and then to put it into the Record.

Mr. HAYDEN. Not at all.

Mr. HILL. I make that request for the reason that, but for the contract, the rescission of this appropriation would not be requested.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. I shall request a copy of the contract, and place it in the Record tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, between lines 12 to 19, inclusive.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment previously passed over will be stated.

The next amendment passed over was, under the subhead "Continuing fund, Southeastern Power Administration," on page 3, line 24, after the word "area", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That the following paragraph under the heading 'Office of the Secretary, continuing fund, power transmission facilities,' in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950—Public Law 350, Eighty-first Congress—is hereby amended to read as follows:

CONTINUING FUND

Continuing fund, power transmission facilities: All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy under the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), generated or purchased in the southwestern power area, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, except that the Treasury shall set up and maintain from such receipts a continuing fund of \$300,000, including the

sum of \$100,000 in the continuing fund established under the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944 (57 Stat. 621), which shall be transferred to the fund hereby established; and said fund of \$300,000 shall be placed to the credit of the Secretary and shall be subject to check by him to defray emergency expenses necessary to insure continuity of electric service and continuous operation of the facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be—

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, just a minute, please; there is objection to that amendment.

Mr. KERR. Yes, Mr. President, there is very strenuous objection to the amendment.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator from Oklahoma has said, there is very strenuous objection to the amendment, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning in line 24, on page 3.

Mr. HAYDEN. As to the amount of money which is made available for the operation and maintenance of the Southeastern power area, I may say that that was the subject of an amendment at the top of page 3, line 2, which amendment has been agreed to. The amendment on page 3, line 24, is the one concerning which there is disagreement.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator from Arizona not understand that the amendment which is now before the Senate is the one on page 3, beginning in line 24?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; and concerning it there is a sharp disagreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that that is the amendment which is before Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, question was raised in committee with reference to lines 13 to 24 on page 3, creating a continuing fund in the Southeastern Power Administration. That is legislation on an appropriation bill. At first, in committee, it was decided, it being a substantive proposition, that to legislate with respect to the Southwestern Power Administration by changing the existing law as to its continuing fund would require a suspension of the Senate rules. On second thought, the majority of the committee decided that, inasmuch as the subject matter was that of continuing funds, the House language could be amended by adding to the provision authorizing the establishment of a continuing fund for the Southeastern Power Administration, a provision which modifies the existing law with respect to the Southeastern Power Administration. In committee, my contention was that it was legislation on an appropriation bill and not germane; that, as to the continuing fund for the Southwestern Power Administration as provided now by existing law, legislation relating to it constituted one substantive proposition, and that the provision inserted by the House, creating a similar

fund for the Southeastern Power Administration was another substantive proposition, and that to attempt to amend the Southeastern provision by inserting a provision in the bill relative to the Southwestern was not proper under the rules of the Senate relative to germaneness.

I could illustrate it in this way: Supposing a bill to admit the Territory of Hawaii into the Union were reported and were pending before the Senate and that an amendment were offered to that bill to admit the Territory of Alaska. Truly, the subject matter would be statehood, but the admission of Hawaii would be one substantive provision, the admission of Alaska would be another substantive provision, and certainly, under the rules of the Senate pertaining to germaneness, it would not be germane to amend the bill in that respect. That is my contention about the matter under discussion and the contention is borne out by what happened in the House of Representatives, where the procedure is different from that in the Senate. In the House, the Chair rules whether a provision is germane; and, under the rules of the House, it was held that a similar amendment was not germane.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator from Arizona make a point of order, or does he not make a point of order? Also, is the Senator from Arizona representing the committee, or is he not representing the committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. The majority of the committee did not agree with me, but I feel constrained to say why there was this disagreement in committee. I am pointing out that fact. The procedure in the House has been long-established, and, as generally quoted from Cannon's Precedents, the two provisions of the House rules which were quoted, and which induced the Chair in the case presented to rule that an amendment of this type was not germane, were, first, from Cannon's Precedents, under "Germaneness," volume 8, pages 2917-2921, which states:

If the effect of striking out the language so affects the scope and import of the text as to present a subject different from that under consideration, it is not germane.

Again, there is a quotation from Cannon's Procedure in the House, on page 12, the last paragraph of which reads as follows:

While an amendment proposing to strike out cannot ordinarily be ruled out of order as not germane, if the effect of striking out the language so affects the scope and import of the text as to prevent a subject different from that under consideration, is not germane.

It is my contention that the provision inserted by the committee, amending the provision contained in the House, contravenes the principle laid down in those two statements I have read. For that reason, I objected, and I thought it proper to make a statement.

As to the merits of the amendment, other Senators may discuss them. I have given my interpretation of the parliamentary rule. The situation in the Senate is that the question of germaneness is not passed upon by the Chair, but it must be submitted, without debate, to be decided by Senate. I did not think it proper to make the point of order at this moment, because it would cut off debate, and I think Senators on both sides of the question ought to have an opportunity to discuss the merits of the proposal.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I am opposed to the amendment reported by the committee, for many reasons. I thoroughly agree with the statement of the Senator from Arizona, that it is not germane. The language which is in the bill has to do with the continuing fund of the Southeastern Power Administration. The amendment which the committee has placed in the bill would constitute a restriction upon previous legislation which set up a continuing fund for the Southwestern Power Administration. There are now before the Congress certain statehood bills for the admission of Territories, which bills provide that the Territories shall become States and shall be admitted to the Union. I do not think Senators would contend that it would be germane to offer an amendment to one of those bills, to deprive of statehood some State that is already a member of the Union; yet that is analogous to what is hereby sought to be done. There is language in the bill setting up a continuing fund for the Southeastern Power Administration. What the amendment seeks to do is to destroy a continuing fund provided in previous sessions of the Congress for the Southwestern Power Administration.

Mr. President, I am also very much opposed to the amendment because of the destructive effect it would have upon the whole power program in the State of Oklahoma and in other areas adjacent thereto. For many years—

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. For a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; I will put it in the form of a question.

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCARRAN. Would it not be well that we determine now, by a vote of the Senate, whether the subject is germane, which would dispose of the matter of germaneness, and which would end the question and save some time? Germaneness is a question which has to be submitted to the Senate for a vote. If the Senator will raise the question now, we can debate it and be through with it. If it is held to be germane, the Senator's objection and the other grounds will stand out more clearly.

Mr. KERR. There are two points with reference to that suggestion. In the first place, my understanding is that if the point of order were made at this time, the question would not be debat-

able and would thereby have to be immediately submitted to a vote. The other point is that I have stated just one of the reasons why I am opposed to the language of the amendment.

Mr. President, for many years there was a fight in the Southwest between private utility companies on the one hand and the Southwest Power Administration on the other hand, with reference to the transmission of power. That fight developed because the private utilities, which, in my opinion, were sincere in their contention, felt they were in position to furnish the rural electrical cooperatives, and others listed by law as preferred customers, with all the power they needed at a reasonable price. They were mistaken in that belief. As time went on, it became apparent to those who were closest to the problem, and who were most familiar with the facts, that the private utility companies had neither the generating capacity nor the lines to provide an ample supply of power to the rural electric cooperatives, nor did they have such projects on the trestleboard or in prospect of being planned in the foreseeable future. Nor were they in position to furnish the power at a reasonable cost.

When the rural electrification program started, various estimates were made by various groups of persons and organizations as to the demand that would exist on the part of farm families for electricity. All the estimates, Mr. President, had one thing in common. They were all far too low. I believe the average of the estimates indicated that it was the thought of those who made them that when power was made available to farm families they would use on the average approximately 75 kilowatt hours a month. It was decided by the private utilities—and on the basis of the estimates, I believe accurately—that they could not furnish power to the average farm family in that quantity for any reasonable price.

The rural electrification program began. It made headway. However, it had not been carried to a third of the farms in Oklahoma when it became apparent that there was no possible way for rural electric cooperatives to obtain adequate power from the utility companies at a reasonable price. It developed that the use for each family each month was nearer 200 kilowatt-hours than 75 kilowatt-hours.

As time has gone on, Mr. President, it is now the considered judgment of those best qualified to know that the demand will be a thousand kilowatt-hours by each farm family each month. It is a known fact that there was no possible way for the private utilities, with the facilities they then had or planned, to meet such a demand at any cost.

The Government, in its flood-control program, began the building of great hydroelectric power projects in my section of the country. That is, they were great projects for that area. I know that our friends in the Tennessee Valley and in the Northwest and along the Missouri would regard them as rather small compared with some of the simi-

lar projects in other areas, but for our area they were great projects.

The Flood Control Act of 1944 specified that power from these flood-control projects would be made available, first, to a certain group of preferred customers, the rural electric cooperatives, municipalities, and Government facilities. As these hydroelectric power projects were being developed, there were demands for the power, the greatest demand being from the Rural Electrification Administration. They were in the situation of not being able to obtain power at all, or of having inadequate quantities of it if they had lines to the homes in the area. They saw an opportunity to have their supplies of power augmented by the power developed at the hydroelectric projects.

Then, with the development of the program of building transmission lines by the Southwestern Power Administration, began the fight by the private utilities to prevent the building of the transmission lines. As time went on, the battle waged back and forth, with some progress being made by the Southwestern Power Administration in securing funds with which to build the transmission lines. I believe they call them backbone transmission lines, and most of them were between the power projects themselves and certain centers where large quantities of power were deliverable.

Senators will remember that 2 years ago, I believe it was, in the Interior Department appropriation bill as it came from the House, there was an appropriation to enable the Southwestern Power Administration to build certain additional transmission lines. As I recall, the provision was stricken out by the Senate committee, and the question came before the Senate as the result of an effort on the part of a number of us to restore the appropriation to the bill. It was then pointed out that the Southwestern Power Administration sometime previously had worked out a wheeling contract—I think that is the proper designation—with the Texas Power & Light Co. It was a contract which made it unnecessary for the Government to build transmission lines. It was a contract which made it possible for the Southwestern Power Administration to take the power generated at the Denison Dam and use the transmission lines of the Texas Power & Light Co. and deliver that Government power, under the arrangements of a wheeling contract, to the customers designated as preferred in the State of Texas.

Douglas Wright was the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration who worked out that contract. He had sought to negotiate similar contracts with the power companies in Oklahoma, Arkansas, and other areas in the Southwest. Those companies had refused to make such contracts. Acting, as they had a right to, on the basis of their own judgment, they took the position, and some of them stated publicly, that it would be criminal for the officials of those companies to make such contracts with reference to the areas they served.

As a result, many of us took the position in the Congress that the money should be appropriated to Douglas Wright with an understanding, based on statements made by him as administrator, that if he were able to work out wheeling contracts with the utilities in Oklahoma and Arkansas and that area generally, the appropriation would not be used, but would be permitted to revert to the Treasury.

After a considerable amount of discussion and debate, Mr. President, the Senate agreed to restore the appropriation to the bill, following which the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration, in accordance with the Statement he had made to many of us, and in accordance with the statement he had made on the floor, negotiated wheeling contracts with the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. and the Public Service Co. of Oklahoma along the lines of the Texas contract. That event, Mr. President, was hailed both in Oklahoma and in Washington as one of the greatest advancements in the use of public power made in the history of that momentous development in our country.

I hold in my hand an article written in the Tulsa Tribune along about that time, which has this headline: "Public-private power truce spells new era for State—Long-time enemies now are buddies."

Mr. President, the Tulsa Tribune is not exactly a New Deal newspaper. However, that great newspaper hailed this accomplishment, this contract between the Southwestern Power Administration and the private utilities in Oklahoma, as one of the most progressive and beneficial steps ever taken in our State. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

[From the Tulsa Tribune of February 10, 1951]

PUBLIC-PRIVATE POWER TRUCE SPELLS NEW ERA FOR STATE—LONG-TIME ENEMIES NOW ARE BUDDIES

(By Roger V. Devlin)

On a wall in an office of the Southwestern Power Administration is a huge map of the Southwest. A large area in the center of the map—embracing all of Oklahoma, a large section of Texas, most of southern Missouri, and a big portion of western and northern Arkansas—is shaded blue.

That blue is the color of an electric spark. It defines the area which, says Douglas G. Wright, SPA Administrator, is being served by the Nation's only partnership of public and private power.

It is an area where industry can be offered, because of that partnership, lower power rates than anywhere else in the country with the exception of the Pacific Northwest and the Tennessee Valley—and probably just as low as TVA.

"It solves a major problem," said Gov. Johnston Murray, after conferring with Wright. "I have every reason to believe we are in better shape than ever to draw new industry to our State."

That map, centering on Oklahoma, is cross-hatched with marks representing major electric lines. All are linked to each other.

It also is studded thickly with bright metal pins whose color identifies major power con-

sumers on or near those lines—municipalities, Rural Electrification Administration units, key industries.

Until recently those power lines were divided into three sections. One was the system of the Public Service Co. of Oklahoma. A second was the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. Both are private utilities.

The third system, consisting principally of a trunk line from north-central Arkansas into east-central Oklahoma, then bending south to reach the Denison Dam on the Red River, was that of the Southwestern Power Administration.

For years the two private systems have fought a no-holds-barred battle against the SPA.

But the battle now is ended. They have become partners in a program which, they have discovered, will be mutually advantageous and will help materially in developing the State.

The Federal Power Commission put its final stamp of approval on the partnership agreement a few days ago. It earlier had been approved by the two companies and the Secretary of the Interior, who is top boss of the SPA.

Two basic factors make the agreement possible and workable: SPA gets its power from hydroelectric projects built and building; PSC and O. G. & E. get theirs from steam generating plants.

But hydroelectric dams must contend with weather factors which provide them with plenty of water energy during flood periods and only small amounts during droughts.

They could operate at top speeds during the one period and close down entirely during the other, but that would be inefficient. They attempt to balance it out by generating at much less than capacity over the full year, or by operating at near capacity for short periods each day, then cutting back for the remainder of the day.

On the other hand, customers of Public Service and Oklahoma Gas & Electric don't require an even flow of power all day long. They turn on their lights in the mornings, again in the evenings, but use little or no electricity during the night and at midday.

But in order to meet the power demands during those "peak" periods, private utilities must install considerably greater generating capacity than they need during the rest of the day.

Both the steam and the hydro systems thus had a grave weakness, economically, when operating, independently and fighting each other.

The partnership eliminated those weaknesses with the stroke of a pen. It tied the two systems together.

The steam plant can operate at a steady, efficient level 24 hours per day. When the peaks hit, hydroelectric generators go to work and handle the extra load. In exchange, the hydro system can draw on the steam plant's steady supply of energy during low water periods.

A second major advantage also enters the picture. Scattered through the area are many small REA units and communities whose power consumption is so small or so scattered that a private power company cannot supply them except at a loss.

On the other hand, those customers are defined as "preferred" by the Government agency and they can buy hydroelectric power at wholesale rates.

In order to serve them, though, the SPA would have to build a whole network of transmission lines—which in many cases might duplicate private lines already in place.

The private-public power partnership also has solved that problem. Southwestern Power, for instance, has a "preferred" customer in western Oklahoma but no lines

anywhere near it. So it sells a block of power to Oklahoma Gas & Electric at a junction point of their two lines. At the other end of an O. G. & E. line, near the customer, SPA buys back that block of power for delivery to the REA.

The private utility is recompensed for what virtually amounts to use of its transmission line. The REA gets a low Government-power rate. Everyone is happy.

Obviously, the partnership—it is called an "interchange agreement"—is much more complicated and detailed than those illustrations.

But the important thing is that, for the first time in history, public and private power have gotten together for their mutual benefit—instead of fighting—and that their cooperation will be of tremendous benefit for Oklahoma and the Southwest.

"The power potentialities of this area, under this agreement are terrific," says Wright. "We can handle any foreseeable industry."

"As far as power is concerned, this can become the most favorable area in the country."

And Governor Murray agrees: "This is the kind of spirit we must have to attract new industries."

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, under the terms of that contract the power-generating facilities of the Southwestern Power Administration, the public utilities, and the Grand River Dam Authority of the State of Oklahoma, were hooked up into one power grid, which gives our area the finest supply of power of any area in the Nation, outside of a very few that have a superabundance of hydroelectric power.

The continuing-fund provision, which is now a part of the law, was placed in the statute by an amendment which I offered at the time, about 2 years ago, when the Senate decided to leave the appropriation in the bill. That continuing-fund provision is necessary to enable the Southwestern Power Administration and the utilities to carry out the wheeling contracts, into which they have entered and which are now in operation. The contracts give Oklahoma rural electric cooperatives an abundant supply of power at a reasonable cost. It had never before been available to them, either in adequate supply or at reasonable cost. If that continuing-fund provision, placed in the statute 2 years ago, is now destroyed by the language which the committee has placed in the bill, it will set back the operation of the rural electric cooperatives in Oklahoma to where they were before the wheeling contracts were made.

The continuing fund involves no cost to the Federal Government, Mr. President. It does not cost the taxpayers one penny. In fact, it is an instrumentality whereby the taxpayers save money, whereby revenue is created for the Treasury of the United States. It is an authorization that has made it possible for the rural electric cooperatives in Oklahoma to solve their problem of having the amount of power which they desire, on a basis which is equitable, and which has had the stamp of approval not only of the Congress which adopted the amendment, not only of the rural electric cooperatives which sought its enactment, but also of the private utility companies that are signatory to the wheeling contracts now in operation, and

which were developed under the provisions of this continuing-fund legislation.

I do not know who now seeks to wreck the structure which has been built up. I do not know who now seeks to make it so that Oklahoma's rural electric cooperatives would be denied the benefits of the contracts they have made. The utility companies are signatories to the contracts. The Southwestern Power Administration, for the Department of the Interior, is signatory to the contracts. The State of Oklahoma has placed its stamp of approval upon them, because its agency, the Grand River Dam Authority, itself, a State hydroelectric project with a great steam plant which it secured from the Federal Government under the Surplus Property Act, generates power which it pours into the grid uniting these three great sources of power. I do not know why Senators from other sections should now seek to interfere in our territory and deprive our citizens of the benefit of these contracts which mean more to the industrial development of Oklahoma and to the development of an adequate farm life in Oklahoma than any other material event I know of that has taken place in a decade.

Mr. President, the Southwestern Power Administration pioneered the equitable wheeling contract between the Federal Government and the private utilities. The Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration has kept faith with the Congress. He has lived up to every agreement which he has made. He has lived up to every directive which the Congress has given him. He has lived up to the letter and the spirit of every directive which the Senate Appropriations Committee has given him. He has provided for his area the wheeling contract which has been acknowledged by many utilities, by industry in my area, and by the Department in Washington, to be the pattern which proves that Federal power, private power, and State power can be developed in the same area under an equitable live-and-let-live arrangement. I am astonished that Senators should now seek to pull the rug out from under that arrangement, that contract, and that situation in my State, and in that area of our country. Without the continuing-fund provision now in the law, the Southwestern Power Administration could not carry out its arrangements with the rural electric cooperatives or with the municipalities which, under the law, are entitled to be recognized as preferred customers. A few weeks ago it was my privilege to visit the little community of Wetumka, in Oklahoma, where they were turning on lights as the result of a contract entered into between the municipality of Wetumka, the Southwestern Power Administration, and one of Oklahoma's great public utilities. For many years they had been operating their own generating plant and their own distribution system. Through the years it had worn out, and they did not have the funds with which to replace it. The power they were producing was inadequate. It was not reliable, and it was costing them something over 2 cents a kilowatt. They came to the Southwestern Power Administration

and the Public Service Co. of Oklahoma. That great public institution and that great private institution, under the terms of the wheeling contract in operation by reason of the continuing-fund provision now in the law, provided electricity to the city of Wetumka. The private utility wheels it to the city gate. There it is delivered to the Southwestern Power Administration, technically under the provisions of the contract, and by it sold to the municipality of Wetumka. So now that community of some 1,500 or 2,000 people has as abundant a supply of electricity as any municipality in the Nation.

They invited me there to turn on the switch. They acted as though they felt that I had a little something to do with working out the arrangement under which they were enabled to have such a contract. In a community with a total population of less than 2,000, 2,500 people gathered on the streets that night to celebrate the turning on of the light available to them because of the contract between the Southwestern Power Administration and the Public Service Co., one of Oklahoma's great public utilities.

If the pending amendment should become the law, it would destroy the workability of that contract. It would take from half the rural electric cooperatives in Oklahoma the power which they now have or expect to have, which would mean the difference between having abundant power at reasonable cost and having inadequate power at excessive cost. I hope that the Senate will disprove this amendment, which does not relate, as the rules of the Senate say it must, directly to the provision it seeks to amend. It does not relate to it even indirectly. I hope the Senate will reject this amendment, which would destroy the workability of the wheeling contract which the Congress itself has said it is our objective to bring about all over the Nation between public power and private power.

The amendment, if adopted, would destroy the workability of the arrangement which the great Southwestern Power Administration has developed with our public and private utilities in such a way as to give the greatest benefit to the rural electric cooperatives and the municipalities which seek power, as well as to the Government facilities in the State of Oklahoma.

At this point I ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, a letter to me from Mr. Douglas C. Wright, Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration, relative to what this amendment would do the workability of his contracts, and relative to the necessity for keeping the law as it is.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION,
Tulsa, Okla., July 9, 1951.
Hon. ROBERT S. KERR,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KERR: In response to your inquiry on the use and necessity for

the continuing fund of the Southwestern Power Administration, I submit the following information.

The continuing fund, which was established in the Interior Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1950, is created in the Treasury of the United States out of revenues derived from the sale of electric power and energy to the customers of Southwestern Power Administration. Not one penny is appropriated to this fund from the general fund of the Treasury. This is in accordance with the law which provides that "all receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy * * * shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, except that the Treasury shall set up and maintain from such receipts a continuing fund of \$300,000, * * *."

This fund is placed to the credit of the Secretary of the Interior and its use is limited to the following three purposes:

1. To defray emergency expenses necessary to insure continuity of electric service and continuous operation of facilities.
2. To cover all costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy.
3. To cover all costs in connection with rentals for the use of facilities for the transmission and distribution of electric power and energy to public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned facilities.

No money has been expended by the Southwestern Power Administration from the continuing fund which was established in the Interior Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1950. Prior to that fiscal year there was in existence a continuing fund of \$100,000, which was limited to emergency expenses necessary to insure continuity of electric service and continuous operation of facilities. That fund has been used by the Southwestern Power Administration only to the extent of \$78,765. This amount was used in 1949 to insure continuity of electric service during the interval between the expiration of funds appropriated by the Congress for the first 8 months of that year and the supplemental appropriation subsequently enacted for the last 4 months. After the supplemental appropriation was enacted, the continuing fund was reimbursed in the amount of \$78,765 from the appropriation.

I am informed that you have been given to understand that there has been or may be misuse of these funds. You can readily see from the limited historic use of the fund and the almost immediate reimbursement thereof that in the past there can have been no misuse of it. In the future there can be no misuse of the fund, because its use is limited to the three stated purposes, and each occasion for such use must be approved by the Secretary of the Interior. This required prior approval is a departmental control, inasmuch as the law makes the money available to the credit of the Secretary of the Interior. In addition, expenditures from the continuing fund are reported to the Congress each year in the budget of the United States.

With the exception of money spent out of the continuing fund to defray emergency expenses, all expenditures from this fund serve in commercial transactions which in turn derive revenues for deposit into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury in amounts greatly exceeding those withdrawn from the continuing fund.

When the continuing fund is used to purchase power from private utilities and rural electric cooperatives this power cannot be stored or destroyed; it can only be delivered to customers. The rates for the purchase and sale of power by Southwestern Power Administration are set forth in each of the pertinent contracts. In addition, the rates charged by the Southwestern Power Administration to its customers must be confirmed and approved by the Federal Power Com-

mission and must be sufficient to return all costs to the Treasury.

In the contract with the private utilities of Oklahoma, Southwestern Power Administration pays a service charge for the use of facilities owned by those companies in delivering electric power and energy to customers of the Government. In the contracts with the large generation and transmission cooperatives the Southwestern Power Administration leases transmission facilities from the cooperatives. As in the case of purchase of power, the payments of service charges to private utilities and of rentals to cooperatives will likewise be made from the continuing fund. In the same fashion, the sale of electric power and energy made possible by these service charges and rentals will return immediately to the Treasury far greater amounts than are expended from the continuing fund.

Without both the money and the authority contained in the continuing fund for the purchase of power and the rental of transmission facilities, all existing contracts with generation and transmission cooperatives and with the private utilities will have to be canceled or completely modified and curtailed.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS G. WRIGHT,
Administrator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, this amendment would deny to the Southwestern Power Administration two rights which it now enjoys. First, it would deny to the Southwestern Power Administration the right to use any of the income from the sale of its power to lease a line. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. That is correct. At the present time, under the continuing-fund authorization, the Southwestern Power Administration out of its revenue can pay for any emergency repairs which may be necessary to maintain the continuity of the flow of electricity.

Secondly, it can lease transmission facilities of a rural electric cooperative which, under the law, has secured a loan and constructed a generating plant and generates power for the use of its customers or for sale to someone else. Under the continuing-fund provision, the Administrator is authorized to lease such lines, which is a boon of inestimable value to the rural electric cooperative, without which it could not have built its facility, without which western Oklahoma rural cooperatives would have had less than a 50-percent supply of electricity.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The thought in my mind is this: When the Southwestern Power Administration enters into a wheeling contract for the delivery of certain Southwestern Power Administration power, what it really does is to enter into a lease. The contract really is a lease in itself. The Administration leases the use of that line to carry power from the Southwestern Power Administration to the REA cooperative or to the municipality, or wherever it may be delivered. So it seems to me that to deny the Southwestern Power Administration the right to lease is to deny to

it the right to do the very thing which Congress has been urging should be done and has been trying to do, namely, the negotiation of wheeling contracts.

Mr. KERR. It would place the Southwestern Power Administration in such a position that the contracts it now has would be unworkable. It would be physically impossible for it to make such contracts with any of the other 10 utilities in the area which it serves.

Furthermore, under the continuing fund provision the Southwestern Power Administration could either buy power from the public utilities or the REA cooperatives and place the money to the credit of the fund when it sold the power.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Oklahoma has well stated previously in his speech that the objective of buying this power is not that the Southwestern Power Administration may have more power to sell because it wants to sell more power, but, rather, in order to make the power which the Government has at a particular dam or reservoir more valuable and bring in a greater return to the Government. It can take power which stands naked and alone as secondary power, or what is sometimes called dump power, which can be sold only at a very cheap price, and step it up, as we say, and convert it into firm power, and thus bring in more return to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Alabama is correct. It has been stated on the floor of the Senate that a continuing-fund authorization for \$300,000 would result in the expenditure of \$67,000,000. The fact of the matter is that no one knows how much power the Southwestern Power Administration will buy and sell.

The fact further is that for every bit of power it buys for a dollar, it will get back more than \$2, for the reason that the arrangement enables it to sell all the power generated at the dams in our area at a very favorable price to the Government, but when furnished to the REA it sells to them at a very low price, because it is enabled to move every bit of power generated at the public power projects into the rural electrical cooperatives and the municipalities at a rate which saves them great amounts of money. At the same time it brings the Government twice as much money as it would get for the power without such an arrangement.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I recall the figures. The Government would be buying the power for about ¼ mill per kilowatt.

Mr. KERR. The Senator means selling it, does he not?

Mr. HILL. Yes, I should have said "selling it." It would use the power to step up its own power and would get 6¾ mills for it by the use of the operation. The Government would receive 6¾ mills per kilowatt for power which, without the arrangement, it would be selling as dump power for one-fourth mill per kilowatt.

Does not the question resolve itself into this: The Government has built the

dams, most of them for flood-control purposes, in order to protect property, crops, and farm lands from the devastation of floodwaters, and since the Government has built the dams, does it not behoove all of us, as trustees for the people, to use the property to the best advantage and bring in the greatest return for the benefit of the taxpayers of the United States?

Mr. KERR. I certainly agree with the Senator, and I would enlarge the point a little. We are trustees in two ways. First, we are trustees in seeing to it that the power generated at the public power project is not sold as dump power. Second, we must see to it that, if possible, the power can be transmitted and delivered to those designated as preference customers under the Flood Control Act. Especially is that dual trusteeship important in view of the fact that the Government, on the one hand, gets at least twice as much for its power, and the preferred customer, on the other hand, is enabled to buy power oftentimes at no more than half of what he would have to pay elsewhere.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to get the matter a little clearer in my mind. As I understand, the Southwestern Power Administration sells to the REA cooperatives throughout the Southwest. Is my understanding correct that if the amendment is adopted, even though the Southwestern Power Administration has adequate power to carry out its contract with the REA's over 9 months of the year, it would be prohibited from spending any of its funds for the purchase of power to carry out its contract in full with the REA's in the event that it is short of power itself for 3 months?

Mr. KERR. That is correct. However, the percentage is a little different than the Senator from Vermont has stated it. It is perhaps even more dramatic than the Senator has stated it. The public power projects are provided with about an 18 percent return. Through the operation of the continuing fund they are able to buy the rest of the power.

Mr. AIKEN. But they cannot buy the rest of the power, if the amendment is agreed to, above the amount of \$200,000?

Mr. KERR. That is correct. They cannot do so with respect to any future contract, and they cannot do it with respect to any contract already made, although the contract may be satisfactory to the utilities and satisfactory to the Government, and even hailed by the REA as the greatest development in Oklahoma's history.

Mr. AIKEN. The cooperatives now depend on the Southwestern Power Administration to supply them with the full amount of their needs?

Mr. KERR. Some of them do, but not all of them. It is due to the fact that the contract has only recently been made. However, as they look into the future and the time when we hope 100 percent of Oklahoma's farms will have rural electrification, I would say to the Senator that at least two-thirds of them

will look to the workability of the contract as a source of abundant power at reasonable cost.

Mr. AIKEN. If the amendment is agreed to the REA cooperatives will have to contract with the Southwestern Power Administration for what power they could get from them, and look elsewhere for the balance of their needs?

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. That would make it more expensive, would it not?

Mr. KERR. It would make it more expensive, make it unworkable, and make the REA's dependent upon various sources of power, not working together, whereas all of them now do work together in the arrangements to which they have agreed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	McFarland
Anderson	Hayden	McKellar
Benton	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bricker	Hennings	Monroney
Bridges	Hill	Moody
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Morse
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Mundt
Byrd	Humphrey	Neely
Cain	Hunt	Nixon
Capehart	Ives	O'Connor
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Clements	Kefauver	Russell
Connally	Kem	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Knowland	Stennis
Duff	Langer	Taft
Dworshak	Lehman	Tobey
Eastland	Lodge	Underwood
Ecton	Long	Watkins
Ellender	Magnuson	Welker
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	McCarran	Williams
Frear	McCarthy	Young
Fulbright	McClellan	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

THE NEED FOR PATIENCE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, last night I participated on the famous Ted Grank radio program entitled "American Forum of the Air," with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. The subject was the significance of the MacArthur hearings. After the broadcast, I chatted with my friend, the distinguished Senator from Washington, about a fundamental difference which seems to me to exist between us, as brought out on that program, concerning the conduct of our foreign policy. He and I agreed that the difference could be expressed in the word "patience."

The discussion between the Senator from Washington and myself dates back to an earlier broadcast in which both of us participated. The People's Platform, in the course of which I advocated patience as applied to our activities in Korea.

The Senator from Washington does not now favor a counsel of patience, as I continue to do, in the face of the severe

provocations with which we have been faced.

Last week in Connecticut I again discovered a widespread feeling of frustration among our people, arising from our experiences in Korea and elsewhere since the termination of the last war. This deep-seated sense of frustration, which is so widespread, may, I fear, cause us as a people to be impetuous, instead of patient. I feel that this is the gravest danger which we as a democracy are facing today.

Mr. President, international politics has often been compared to a poker game. It seems to me that the analogy was never more true than it is today. It is a deadly poker game, with our very survival as the stake for which we are playing. Furthermore, we do not hold all the good cards, although some of my friends seem to think we do. However, we like to think that we Americans are good poker players and can develop the skill and the patience we need if we are to win.

Mr. President, on the strength of the conversation of last night, I have sought recognition for 3 or 4 minutes in order to plead with the Congress and with the American people for patience, because I believe it is our weapon and that we must learn how to use it. We should not abdicate its use to the Kremlin.

When I was a young man in the advertising business, a famous copywriter named McManus, in Detroit, wrote a noteworthy advertisement for the Cadillac Motor Co., with the headline, "The Penalty of Leadership." That phrase became one of the great commercial phrases of the twenties. Mr. President, the penalty of American leadership in the world today is that we must seek to learn patience.

In the course of my conversation with the Senator from Washington, following the broadcast last night, in my effort to advance my argument, I referred to the lead article appearing in yesterday's magazine section of the New York Times. The article, which is entitled, "Patience: Atomic Weapon in the Cold War," is written by Barbara Ward, former foreign editor of the Economist, of London, and author of *The West at Bay*, and *Policy for the West*. I think the article is so important that it should be called to the attention of the Congress and of all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD. (See exhibit A.)

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I am only sorry that the article as it will be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD cannot show the cartoon which appears at the top of the page in the New York Times magazine section to illustrate the article. The cartoon shows Prime Minister Atlee and President Truman tensely looking across a table at each other, almost leaping out of their chairs in their anxiety, and between them is a paper bearing the words "Korea, China." At the other end of the table, leisurely lolling back, with his pipe in his hand, is

the figure of Stalin, and before him is a little paper with the words, and each of these words has a question mark after it, Germany? Yugoslavia? Mideast?"

I told the Senator from Washington that I would send him this article. I am glad to have this opportunity today of sending it to him through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because this insures for it a far larger audience.

Mr. President, there never has been a time in all our history, in my judgment, when the virtue of patience should be so strongly urged and commended to the American people.

EXHIBIT A

[From the New York Times magazine section of July 8, 1951]

PATIENCE: ATOMIC WEAPON IN THE COLD WAR—WHATEVER HAPPENS IN KOREA, WE NEED TO PREPARE TO OUTDO THE RUSSIANS AT THEIR WAITING GAME

(By Barbara Ward)

We need not doubt that for Stalin Korea is just an episode. True it has been an unlucky episode, since it has proved the chief cause of massive rearmament in the west and may yet be even unluckier—as unlucky for Soviet prestige as the failure of the Berlin blockade and the attempted Communist capture of Greece. But for the Kremlin all these events are simply incidental to a much broader purpose—consolidation and extension of Communist power. This process will not be checked by a local rebuff.

The pressure which has met a firm barrier in Berlin or Greece or on the thirty-eighth parallel will simply be renewed in some other apparently propitious spot. The Western Powers could not make any greater mistake than to confuse a local Communist maneuver or misfortune with general change in the direction of Communist policy. That is the arena of history itself. For this reason we in the west must avoid all belief in sudden decisive settlements. To hold the enemy in Korea is victory, but it is the winning of a battle not of a whole campaign.

The course of events since the war indicates that the Soviet Union's preferred strategy is to play a waiting game. This likelihood becomes all the more plausible when one considers how many cards Stalin must believe himself to hold, provided the struggle between the Communist and free worlds drags on over the years and over the decades.

In a sense, the rulers in the Kremlin can convince themselves that their struggle against the west is already won. History has won it for them. The "sentence of the watchers" has gone forth on capitalism, and it is due to follow mercantilism and feudalism and slave ownership into the limbo of obsolete societies. Now that communism, the new (and final) version of economic order, has taken firm root in Soviet Russia it is destined by the inscrutable dialectic of history to conquer the world. The west is only fighting a futile rear-guard action. The end is certain.

This underlying confidence in the verdict of history gives considerable strength and flexibility to Soviet strategy. There is no need to hurry an unavoidable climax. Since the west must of necessity weaken and stagnate, it is not absolutely necessary to defeat it in a military head-on collision this year or next. On the contrary, if the Western Powers show signs of alarm and vigilance, the Soviet Union would be well advised to avoid provocation and wait until once more the confusion and collapse decreed by fate overtake them. Then, indeed, quick military action, backed by Russia's accumulated strength, can deliver the coup de grâce to the rotting structure of the

free world. But there is no hurry. Those who have history on their side can afford to wait.

There can be no doubt that this perverted, yet in some way sublime, view of the world conflict admirably suits certain aspects of the Russian character. That Russia should be the site of the consummation of history is not a new thought for Russians. Centuries have passed since an orthodox prophet called Moscow "the third Rome." The recently published fragments of Dostoevsky's autobiography show that this man, who as a novelist wrote incomparably of the grandeur and servitudes of the Russian soul, was a fervid nationalist when he turned his pen to journalism and called for Russian leadership and Russian world dominion. Russian Messianism has simply found a new outlet in Marx's dialectic of history.

But possibly the most fateful correspondence between the Marxist world view and the character of the Russian people lies in the fact that both can afford to wait. Probably no people on earth are better at waiting than the Russians. There may be queues in other parts of the world, but nowhere do the people wait in them with such oxlike calm. There may be good chess players in other nations, yet Russia produces one unbeaten champion after another in this game in which one move may take hours. One must be patient to talk the night through about one's own soul and spend the next night listening to a neighbor's confidences. One must be patient in the long Siberian winters and among the vast distances of the unending steppes. Stalin can, if he chooses, call on incomparable reserves of patience and inertia. He can play—as Hitler could not—the waiting game.

The Western Powers are not necessarily as well off. They do not appear to be sustained by any particular view of world history. Their earlier view—the Victorian confidence in automatic progress—has not survived two world wars or the evidence dug up by archaeologists in the sands of the Near East that great civilizations have flourished and crumbled again and again in the brief span of human history. This collapse of confidence in automatic progress would be no bad thing if it led to the opposite philosophy—it was Goethe's—that each generation must act and suffer and create in order to preserve its standards. "What you have inherited from your fathers, struggle to build for yourself." But suppose the consequence is the disappearance of any sense of history at all? Even a false Marxist idea is likely to be more potent than a vacuum.

Nor, at first glance, do the West's reserves of patience seem as striking as those of the Slavs. Britain, it is true, has had some experience of the waiting game—and against Russia. The essence of the eastern question during most of the nineteenth century was Britain's successful determination to keep Russia out of Constantinople, if necessary by force. Another effective achievement of sustained defense occurred in India where, for half a century, British and Indian troops fought a never-ending series of small local wars to keep the northwest frontier inviolate. Here, too, Russian agents were often an intrusive element. But these instances of successful "containment" concerned only a fraction of the British people—the men serving regularly in the navy and army—whereas sustained defense today involves everyone.

In the United States, the tradition of long-drawn-out defense is even more strikingly absent. America's participation in two world wars was nearer to the forming of a sheriff's posse to round up a gang of rustlers and then disband them, to participation in a police force which is never off the job.

Even some of the emotional force behind the great debate on Korea came from the angry belief that there must be a quick way

out of the local war. And this deep and entirely understandable desire for quick results has appeared in other fields—in the "get rich quick" tradition of the old business system; the rapid plowing and turning up of the Great Plains that let in the scourge of soil erosion; the thrust of competition and ambition; the electric, stimulating, immensely zestful atmosphere of so much of American life.

But is it, can it, be patient? Can it endure as well as build? Has it fortitude as well as force? One answer is certain: Nowhere in the United States or the British Commonwealth or Europe is there the endurance of the Russian people. To that degree of stoicism we cannot return. But it does not follow that the zest and the life and the movement cannot be controlled in a more dynamic patience, in a strength that is all the more effective because it is the strength not of a stone but of a coiled spring.

In the last two decades the lesson of sustained effort has been learned in field after field of western life; and the United States, apparently the most volatile partner, has repeatedly given the lead. One need only refer in business enterprise to the steady trend in the last two decades of plowing back profits into reserve, and preferring the strength and continuity of the enterprise to the possibility of a quick raking in of profits. In the last decade the percentage of profits thus devoted to reinvestment has risen from 30 to 60 percent. In agriculture soil conservation has followed in the path of soil erosion, and all over the European Continent and, by American example in other continents as well, the careful husbanding and re-creation of the topsoil has taken the place of the old spendthrift farming.

All this represents the fruits of patience. We need not despair of seeing it extended to the field of diplomacy and defense. In fact, it is there already. The essence of "containment" is patience. The rationale of the "limited war" is patience. And could any three men have given a more moving display of fortitude than the American, British, and French foreign ministers' deputies who endured—without a single instance of bodily assault—week after week of Mr. Gromyko's insults and prevarications?

The Western Powers are already showing that they can match Russian endurance. Our fortitude will be all the more vital and creative for being achieved and won, and not inbred by habit and environment. But patience is not the only Russian asset. They believe history is on their side. The world revolution which has already established its immense bridgehead in the Soviet Union is not simply going to give Russia world dominion. It is the end of history, the consummation of history, the beginning of perfect freedom, happiness, and security. It is utopia. It is the end of the world.

No one will underestimate the potency of this ideal. It has haunted mankind since the dawn of civilization, and even though some men have looked back to find the perfect society—to a lost Golden Age—and others have looked forward for it, and some have wanted it here and now on earth, and others have been content to find it hereafter, the idea of it has always stirred the hungry heart of man.

The Communists not only know the attraction of this longing, but they know that they can present it in a particularly appealing form. According to their doctrine, utopia must come automatically once the order of capitalists and kulaks and kings and priests has gone down to its inevitable doom. The perfect society must come, and its delay is someone else's fault. There could be no more effective appeal to the mixture of dreaming and irresponsibility that play so large a part in the human spirit.

It is no coincidence that the Communists offer this heady brew, in the first place, to adolescents and to younger men and women.

They do not care if experienced citizens—say in eastern Europe—oppose them today and tomorrow. They are looking to the day after that when the thousands of intoxicated youths who marched through Berlin in last year's Communist youth rally will have taken office and power, and will fill the police force and the bureaucracy, and the courts and the army.

It is another manifestation of the policy of patience. "We are prepared to wait," the Soviet leaders seem to say. "Our picture of the future is so binding, the dream so strong, the finding of scapegoats so attractive, the sloughing off of personal guilt so great a relief, that we can forget the older men with experienced eyes and tired faces. Give us the bright, blank face of youth, and we will print on it our pattern of power and conquest. You may oppose us today. To us belongs tomorrow."

This is not an idle challenge. Whatever else it is, the western way of life is not a utopia. It offers no automatic security for the good life. It cannot promise any historically conditioned coming of the kingdom. Just as it has learned that each generation must re-create its own standards or lose them—there is no inevitable collective progress—so it has learned that each individual human personality must find its own kingdom and build its own utopia.

The founding fathers, after all, provided the best definition of the western way of life. Government, the state, must guarantee life, liberty, and the means of pursuing happiness. But happiness is not within its power to give. Happiness comes not from a social order imposed by history or by Stalin but from each man's success in his pursuit, and his understanding of where it truly lies. Not a single, automatic, state-provided utopia, but the possibility of the western way of life.

True, society can hamper this possibility. It may give too little security to life, it may interfere with liberty, it may cramp and stifle the means—health, opportunity, education—of pursuing happiness. In effect, government has an immense range of negative possibilities. But on the positive side, it can do no more than pass an enabling act and hope for the best.

We have to admit that this view of human destiny is infinitely more complex and provisional than the Messianic promises of communism. To young people especially, the happiness that comes in one apocalyptic burst from outside is more appealing than the happiness that is built doggedly year after year by personal effort and sacrifice and wisdom. This essence of democracy is particularly unsuited to being yelled from platforms, howled into loudspeakers, dragged through processions, and written in 20-foot-high letters on the billboards. Youth wants headier wine than democracy can offer. Does the future, then, belong, after all, to the Communist idea?

The Western World should not be complacent in seeking an answer, any more than it should be quite confident about its own reserves of patience. The risk is real. The danger is obvious. The regimentation of youth in every country beyond the iron curtain is a fact. Yet once again the Soviet advantage is not as great as it seems at first.

Even if we in the west have thought and done too little about the ideological struggle for the mind of the young, nevertheless the good sense and staying power—and the sense of humor—of western youth should not be underestimated. It was by a free decision, for instance, that the British National Union of Students recently disaffiliated itself from the world body which the Communists had captured. And the underlying reasons for the disaffiliation are significant. It sprang from the realization that whatever else the Communist students assembled in Prague might be, they were not free. However much the Western World may still fall short in

its provision of the means for pursuing happiness it has not failed with life and liberty. Students breathing the free air of English universities could recognize the dank smell of the prison behind the Communists' boastful talk.

The Soviet Union, on the other hand, suffers from the insurmountable obstacle that the Kingdom of Heaven descended in 1917 and has been getting more fixedly intolerable ever since. When André Gide visited Russia as an enthusiastic Communist in 1936, and returned as a disillusioned opponent, one of the turning points in his conversion was to discover that in Soviet Russia unhappiness had become counterrevolutionary. Utopia was here, everybody was therefore happy. If you were miserable, it could only be a plot.

So, today, the chief obstacle of the Soviet version of the millennium is that it has already arrived, and that its compulsorily happy millions are among the most wretched of mankind. Between the idea and the reality has fallen the shadow. By promising total happiness, the Soviet Union has undermined its capacity to promise anything at all.

In the west, the promise has been more modest. The state indeed makes no promises at all. It can only offer opportunities. But when individual men and women, secure in life and liberty, seize upon those opportunities, the result can be not only the quiet and unsensational Utopias of those who live in peace with their families, their neighbors, and their fellow workers. It can be more than this, great as this peaceful happiness may be. It can, on occasion, be the full coming of the kingdom of which communism is a perversion and a sham. We know, to the Christian roots of our society, that the personal destiny of man transcends history, transcends society, transcends the vast, anonymous collectiveness of the modern total state.

The flowering of goodness and greatness in the individual personality of the free citizen is a goal beyond any goal proposed by communism. Its realization has a force before which all Communist manipulations of the masses must fail. Wesley preaching to the miners, Shaftesbury reforming the factories, Lincoln freeing the slaves, Pasteur in his laboratory, Schweitzer in his African mission—these are the summits of western achievement. These are the deepest roots of western power.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] inserted in the RECORD last Friday a statement concerning certain reductions which he proposed to make in the appropriations contained in the pending bill. I think that was a very fair and a very proper thing for him to do.

I desire to say that I am as much interested in economy as is the Senator from Illinois. I intend to vote for some of the cuts to which he suggested in his statement of last Friday. In fact, in the committee I voted for one or two which the Senator from Illinois did not see fit to mention.

However, he suggests cuts in the appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service which I definitely feel would involve not true economy, but false econ-

omy. I think most of us realize that fish and wildlife have an esthetic value. They have a great recreational value for 25,000,000 or 30,000,000 people who hunt and fish.

Mr. President, the June issue of Sports Afield contains a compilation of figures which show that the fish and wildlife resources of this Nation constitute a \$4,000,000,000 annual business. If we estimate from the pending bill the item for predator control, which is meant almost exclusively for the protection of livestock in the West, to protect it from coyotes and mountain lions, it will be found that this is the only agency of the Government to which the sportsmen of America contribute more than twice the amount which Congress appropriates, even including the maintenance of our great commercial fisheries, which constitute a business in themselves, and in which the sportsmen, as such, are not primarily interested.

Some years ago, when Congress was about to drop the provision for an 11-percent excess tax on sporting arms and ammunition, the distinguished former Senator from Nevada, Mr. Pittman, and I succeeded in obtaining passage of a bill which provided for grants-in-aid to the States. It is now commonly referred to as the Pittman-Robertson Act, under which the States have been getting approximately \$10,000,000 a year for the protection of game. Last year, the Congress passed a bill which was earmarked as a tax on sporting equipment for fishing, from which there will probably be collected \$1,500,000 or \$2,000,000. Some years ago, as chairman of a Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources in the House, I assisted in the drafting and passage of a bill to require every duck hunter to pay \$1 for a stamp, even if he went hunting only once. Two years ago, we raised the fee to \$2. Those funds, put up by sportsmen, as I have said, amount to more than twice what is carried in the pending bill for this great natural resource.

Mr. President, there are not many Senators on the floor at this time, and some of those who are now present may not be here when the debate occurs on the Douglas amendments regarding the fish and wildlife item; so I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an analysis of the cuts proposed by the Senator from Illinois in the appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service contained in the Senate bill.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES—GENERAL

The effect of that part of the amendment requiring a further general decrease of \$180,000, after disallowing the budget estimates for administration of fish and game laws, hatchery operations, and the maintenance and operation of refuges, would be to further curtail activities which are the basic element of the national program of fish and wildlife conservation. At a time when hatchery fish are required in ever-increasing numbers due to the increased number of fishermen, the creation of farm ponds, and new reservoirs, and the loss of fishing waters by pollution, it would require the outright closure of existing hatcheries. Many of these have been in operation for over 50 years.

There would be a further necessity for a decrease in the number of men enforcing the Federal game laws at a time when there are more hunters than ever before and when violations are on the increase. Enforcement of the Federal regulations already leans heavily on the States for assistance, but this would throw an increasing burden upon the State conservation agencies and leave only a token number of Federal agents to cover the States. In many instances it would leave not more than one or two Federal agents to enforce the waterfowl and other Federal regulations within a whole State.

As for the Federal refuge system, it would add to the difficulty of simple maintenance of the buildings, roads, fences, water-control structures, and other facilities which are essential to the successful operation of a refuge. These areas are the principal wintering, resting, feeding, and nesting spots for our continental waterfowl populations. Only by maintaining these refuges in the maximum condition of productivity as a means of supplementing adequate enforcement of the regulations can the populations of waterfowl be built up to the levels of earlier days.

The committee action in allowing the full estimates for operation and maintenance of these field activities was sound. A cut-back upon these operations will have immediate and lasting effects upon wildlife resources which can be maintained under present conditions only by providing additional habitat to replace that which is lost by industrialization, population increase, and drainage.

MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES—ADMINISTRATION OF FISH AND GAME LAWS

The proposal to eliminate \$78,091 from the appropriation for administration of fish and game laws would primarily affect the administration of Alaska fisheries. The highly important Alaska salmon fishery has shown serious depletion and there has been an increase of from 200 to 300 percent in the number of fishing boats in the last several years. The amount of \$33,136 was requested in order to employ seven additional fishery management aides and to supply the funds necessary for their operations in the Territory of Alaska. At the present time the enforcement of the Alaska fishery regulations is carried on with a staff of 26 field enforcement officers and agents, and this is obviously an inadequate force in view of the vast territory of the Alaska coastline that has to be covered. Without the funds called for by this estimate the enforcement and management of this resource, which has an annual value approaching \$100,000,000, would be further impaired. The cut would also eliminate funds required for within-grade promotions of agents enforcing the Alaska game laws and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. A further result would be the elimination of any staff for the enforcement of several treaties to which the United States is a party. These include the Sockeye Salmon and Northern Pacific Halibut Treaty Acts, the Whaling Convention Act, and the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention Act, all of which call for enforcement of regulations by personnel of the Fish and Wildlife Service. The amounts required for these various functions are less than \$40,000. Inability to meet treaty obligations under these acts will reflect upon the good faith of the United States.

MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES—PROPAGATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF FOOD FISHES

In order to meet the cut of \$181,632 proposed by the Douglas amendment, the only alternative is to close hatcheries to maintain present production at the remaining hatcheries. At least eight hatcheries would have to be closed, and in addition propaga-

tion of mussels would have to be discontinued.

The estimate in the budget for the operation of new and expanded facilities was to operate fish-cultural stations where Congress has provided funds for additional facilities. It would be impossible to use these facilities and they would have to lie idle until such times that funds could be provided.

This curtailment will involve the operation of new hatcheries in Michigan, Massachusetts, Georgia, and North and South Dakota, as well as expanded facilities in Arizona, Washington, Montana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, Virginia, West Virginia, and eight other States.

Funds for the replacement of automotive equipment anticipates the replacement of two units out of a total of 289, which is approximately .5 percent replacement whereas the normal life of automotive equipment anticipates an annual replacement of 10 to 11 percent.

An adequate replacement program for fish screen equipment has never been provided. If funds are not provided in the amount requested, at least one of the screens will have to be closed. This would result in the loss of thousands of down-stream migratory salmon and a loss to the commercial fishery. The number of down-stream migratory salmon saved by the operation of a fish screen is often far in excess of the number that could be provided by a hatchery.

MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES—MAINTENANCE OF MAMMAL AND BIRD RESERVATIONS

This proposed elimination of \$168,250 (budget increase) include an item of \$62,500 for replacement of equipment on the wildlife refuges. The cost of normal annual replacement requirements for the 1,049 units of operating and maintenance equipment on the refuges for the fiscal year 1952 should be \$363,800. The amount requested represents only slightly more than one-sixth of these requirements. The present average life of equipment now in operation varies from 8 years for automotive equipment to 15 years for tractors; some of the equipment in use was acquired in the early 1930's. Equipment primarily involved in the request includes pickup and other operation and maintenance trucks and tractors required for farming and dike and road maintenance.

Public Law 534 (80th Cong.), commonly referred to as the Lea Act, provided for the establishment of waterfowl management areas in California to provide feeding areas for waterfowl to alleviate damage to agricultural crops in the Central and Imperial Valleys of California. Since passage of the Lea Act, funds have been provided by the Congress each year for the acquisition of land under this program. Under the appropriation Maintenance of mammal and bird reservations, there are included funds in the amount of \$81,602 which were to be used as follows:

For farming operations on Lea Act lands acquired as an addition to the Colusa Refuge.....	\$10,000
For farming on Lea Act lands added to the Salton Sea Refuge.....	25,000
For staffing and placing in operation an area in the San Joaquin Valley..	46,602
	81,602

The latter area, now referred to as the Merced waterfowl management area, was acquired in the spring of 1951. This is the only Federal acquisition in the San Joaquin Valley, and it is very essential, if it is to furnish the protection for agricultural crops anticipated, that it be put in operation at once. The former owner of the property put 700 acres in barley before turning the property over to the Government. This crop

is to be made available for waterfowl feeding during the coming season, and must be irrigated if it is to be brought to maturity. Soil preparation must also be started in 1951 for the 1952 crop. It is essential, therefore, that the funds requested, which will provide for a minimum permanent staff, operating expenses, and the necessary farming equipment, be provided.

The increase also provided an item of \$15,398, which would provide one additional person for the 2,000,000-acre Kenai National Moose Range in Alaska, one man for a new waterfowl refuge area in Alaska which has not previously been staffed and minimum operating expenses for this refuge. The refuge staff in Alaska is at present far below that required for proper operations on these areas, and setting up the two new positions will still leave this critical area understaffed.

The increase also included an item of \$8,750 to cover within-grade salary advancements.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE—INVESTIGATION OF RESOURCES

The effect of the action already taken in the House in reducing the budget estimates and of the further reduction proposed by the Senate committee is to eliminate studies of both sport and commercial fisheries of the Atlantic coastal waters—a study which was authorized by Public Law 730 of the Eighty-first Congress. In addition, investigations required for the effective management of the commercially important Alaska salmon fisheries would be curtailed. A further effect would be to cut back exploratory work intended to develop a commercial fishery for tuna in the North Atlantic. Beyond this, the curtailment would affect normal long-continuing statistical and technological work by disallowing normal increase in operating costs.

The additional proposed curtailment of \$358,000 as carried in the Douglas amendment is not directed to any specific activities, but its effects would inevitably apply to studies already under way intended to foster and promote commercial fisheries and to other long-term investigations looking toward more scientific management and conservation of wildlife and of sport fisheries. Among the commercial fisheries studies which would be drastically curtailed or eliminated are investigations directed toward the development of a tuna fishery in the vast Central Pacific area where this Nation has acquired new responsibilities for the support of the natives. Fisheries remain the most promising resource in that area.

Another item which would have to be materially retarded or postponed would be an investigation of the cause of the terrific decline in the pilchard fishery of the West Coast. This appropriation also carries the funds expended for a study of means of controlling the sea lampreys in the Great Lakes which have virtually decimated the fisheries of Lake Michigan and Lake Huron. It would apply to exploratory fishing investigations of the Gulf of Mexico and the North Pacific areas where there are latent undeveloped fisheries which could be developed to the economic benefit of the respective areas and provide additional food in case of emergency.

The statistical program, which provides the basic statistical data upon which the Government as well as the fishing industry depends for its knowledge of the economic status of the industry, would likewise suffer a curtailment. In 1951, for the first time in many years, there has been a complete statistical survey of the fishing industry as a whole. This could not be continued in the face of the proposed cuts. Technological studies involving the utilization of fishery byproducts and the better handling and utilization of fishery products as a whole would have to be dropped.

Among the wildlife items which would be affected would be studies to improve methods of controlling the depredations of certain birds and animals which now cause losses to agriculture. The new chemicals which are being widely used for the control of insects have very serious effects upon wildlife and fish, and the Fish and Wildlife Service has considered it imperative to make observations of these effects in order to suggest means of application which would minimize the damage to highly beneficial wildlife.

The general programs of the Fish and Wildlife Service in these fields have been directed toward developing methods of improving the production of game birds and animals on agricultural lands and public lands in order to recommend to administrative agencies as well as to private landowners better methods of achieving a secondary crop of game birds and animals. These studies also include investigations on wildlife diseases which periodically exert a heavy toll upon our stocks of game.

In addition, the cooperative wildlife research units, operated on a joint basis with the States, agricultural colleges, and certain private organizations, are conducted under this appropriation and would be subject to material reduction.

The exact extent to which these various programs would be cut back under the proposed reduction of \$358,000 is not capable of being specifically defined at the moment, but it is obvious that all of them would have to be restricted to a point where their effectiveness would be seriously impaired.

RIVER BASIN STUDIES

The deletion of the "River basin studies" item of \$263,442 would almost completely prevent the carrying out of substantial obligations under the provisions of two statutes, the act of August 14, 1946 (16 U. S. C. 661), and sec. 18 of the Federal Power Act (16 U. S. C. 811), and thus preclude action toward fish and wildlife protection concurrent with the construction of reservoirs and other river-basin developments. It would bring to a halt the design and installation of fish and wildlife protective facilities on water-use projects throughout a great part of the country that are presently in advanced planning and construction stages.

Fish and wildlife conservation must be integrated with the developments being made by all Federal agencies and by private power companies during the periods when detailed plans of construction are being made and after construction has started. These conservation measures are developed by specialists after study of the detailed construction plans, and are directed to the prevention of unnecessary destruction of important commercial fish and fur bearers as well as irreplaceable sport fish and game. The studies are not advanced planning in the general sense but are concentrated upon specific projects which are under consideration for specific authorization by the Congress or for private development.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to point out that the House cut the appropriations for the wildlife agency below the Budget estimate, and the Senate committee cut it again. I think the Senate committee cut it as far as we could prudently go, and that the further cuts proposed by the distinguished Senator from Illinois should not be adopted.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that most of the States also make large contribu-

tions for the purpose of getting rid of predatory animals?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is undoubtedly true in the West. We used to make such an appropriation in Virginia, but we do not have it now. Pennsylvania makes a very large appropriation for that purpose. Many States make such appropriations, and practically all States, so far as I know, spend a great deal of money on the conservation of wildlife resources. I have forgotten the total, but it is very large.

Mr. LANGER. If the Senator will yield further, one of the very best purposes for which the money can be spent is as a defense against coyotes and wolves.

Mr. ROBERTSON. If the Douglas amendment should be agreed to, that program would take a big cut, and it would mean a reduction in livestock in the West. If the wolves and mountain lions eat the livestock, we do not eat it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I submit two amendments intended to be proposed by me to the pending bill. They apply to the Southeastern and Southwestern Power Administrations, and to the same restriction upon the building of transmission facilities which is proposed by the so-called Keating amendment on Bureau of Reclamation funds. I ask that the amendments be printed for the consideration of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on page 3 of the pending bill, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, beginning in line 24, to and including line 22, on page 4, appears the committee amendment covering the continuing fund for the Southwestern Power Administration. The amendment is an amendment to the provision for the continuing fund for the Southeastern Power Administration, which was placed in the bill by the House, so that, even though the latter is legislation, it is not subject to a point of order in the Senate. The committee amendment, being an amendment to the House provision, although it is also legislation, is not subject to a point of order, because it is germane to a provision already in the bill.

It is germane, Mr. President, because both amendments deal with the same subject matter, continuing funds for the power-marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior, both agencies having been created under the same basic authority, section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, and both amendments proposing to authorize the same thing, the establishment of a continuing fund and the use of such fund for emergency purposes and to insure the continuity of service.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will adopt the committee amendment relating to the Southwestern Power Administration continuing fund. The purpose of the amendment is to place the continuing fund of the Southwestern Power Administration on the same basis that is recommended for the continuing fund of the Southeastern Power Administration, and on the same basis that is

recommended for the continuing fund for the Bonneville Power Administration. In other words, all the amendment does is to put the Southwestern Power Administration on the same basis with any other agency established under similar circumstances.

In respect to the Bonneville Power Administration, the basic act creating that agency established a continuing fund of \$500,000. The act was approved on August 20, 1937, and it is extremely significant that from that day to this the Bonneville Power Administration has operated under its provisions, and has been able to carry on and to follow the directives laid down by the Congress.

The provision for the continuing fund may be found in 16 United States Code 832-J, and reads as follows:

All receipts from transmission and sale of electric energy generated at the Bonneville project shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts, save and except that the Treasury shall set up and maintain from such receipts a continuing fund of \$500,000 to the credit of the Administrator and subject to check by him—

Listen to the language, Mr. President—to defray emergency expenses and to insure continuous operation.

That is exactly the language proposed in the pending amendment, and the same language is applied to the Southeastern Power Administration.

Mr. President, if we note carefully the language used with reference to the continuing fund of the Bonneville Power Administration, it will be seen that the language is identical with the language in the bill creating the continuing fund for the Southwestern Power Administration, and in the committee amendment.

Mr. President, I should like to review briefly the background of the operation of the Southwestern Power Administration, so that the Senate will have before it material which goes far to explain the committee's position in recommending that the use of the continuing fund of the Southwestern Power Administration be curtailed.

Let me say at the outset that no members of the committee are against the rural electrification program, or against making Government power available at the cheapest rate possible to preference customers. Attempts are always made in debates on these matters to put the issue as being solely whether one is for or against the rural electrification program. In spite of the many words that will be used to convince us, that issue is not involved. I repeat, that issue is not involved.

What, then, is involved? That can best be answered by the phrase "financial sleight-of-hand" or "now-you-see-it-and-now-you-do-not." Very simply stated, the continuing fund of the Southwestern Power Administration has become an issue, because the fund, since its use was expanded in the Interior Appropriation Act of 1950, has been used as a device through which the Southwestern Power Administration is acquiring facilities and expanding in a manner that was never contemplated

by the Congress. I will point out the details of this in just a moment. The acquisition of facilities and the expansion of the operation are being accomplished by the method of the Southwestern Power Administration entering into lease and purchase agreements with so-called REA super-co-ops, whereby the super co-ops borrow money from the Rural Electrification Administration to construct transmission lines and build steam generating plants. To make the loan feasible, the super co-ops must demonstrate that such loans will be repaid. The lease and purchase agreement contract between the super co-ops and the Southwestern Power Administration is the guaranty for the loan. These agreements extend for 40 years and at the end of such time, when the loan has been repaid, the facilities will belong to the Southwestern Power Administration, an agency of the Department of the Interior.

Let us analyze this situation a little more. The Rural Electrification Administration loans money for generating and transmission facilities to a super co-op. There is nothing wrong with this and up to this point everything is completely legal and aboveboard. The super co-op then enters into a lease-and-purchase agreement with the Southwestern Power Administration. Also up to this point everything is legal, since the super co-op, so long as it meets the terms of the loan, can do with its facilities what it pleases. But now comes the peculiar twist to this transaction. The Southwestern Power Administration through the device of the continuing fund, out of which payments are made to the super co-ops under the lease-and-purchase agreements, practically acquires complete and full ownership of facilities without ever having to come to the Congress. Once having accomplished this, the Southwestern Power Administration then can commit Congress to more and more operation and maintenance funds for the growing system.

The record discloses that this continuing fund has been used and will be used to guarantee repayment of over \$66,000,000 in loans made by the Rural Electrification Administration to the super co-ops for the construction of transmission systems and steam generating facilities, none of which was ever approved by the Congress and none of which will ever be approved by the Congress if this system continues.

Approximately 3,578 miles of transmission lines will be constructed. A substantial portion of these lines will be leased and eventually purchased by the Southwestern Power Administration through its continuing fund. The Congress has clearly laid down the principle that it must appropriate all funds for the construction or purchase of transmission facilities.

That has been a policy laid down in the beginning, and it has come down until today.

In addition, several steam plants will be constructed, and here again the Southwestern Power Administration has contracted to take their entire output. While this technically is not a lease of

steam generating facilities, yet for all practical purposes it is the same thing. Remember that all of this is being done without prior approval of the Congress.

Now the argument will be made that in choosing to illustrate the transaction by using as an example a super co-op, I completely ignore the fact that the continuing fund is also used to carry out the contracts between the Southwestern Power Administration and the private utilities in Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Texas. The charge would be correct except for the fact that these same private utilities have testified before the Appropriation Committees of the Congress that the continuing fund is not needed to carry out the terms of their contract and that it should be limited to emergency expenses only.

In that regard, I refer to the testimony of Mr. Gesell, as it appears on page 1609 of the Senate committee hearings. He said:

MR. GESELL. So far as the Oklahoma contract is concerned, it is not essential that the continuing fund exist at all. The Texas Power & Light Co. contract with the Southwestern Power Administration, already in operation for 4 years, has never required the use of the continuing fund for its successful operation.

Senator ELLENDER. How do they operate?

MR. GESELL. They balance the purchases by the Texas Co. as against the purchases by the Government.

Again Mr. Gesell said, as it appears on page 1610 of the hearings:

MR. GESELL. The Oklahoma contract is a variant of the Texas Power & Light Co. agreement, and likewise does not require the use of the continuing fund. It would be very simple for the Administrator to estimate his money requirements for purchasing power from the Oklahoma companies and to include such amount with other annual requests for appropriations in case the balancing did not work out properly. It is our belief that the Administrator should justify all of his expenses before this committee each year. It would not be difficult for him to do so.

So, Mr. President, the continuing fund is not essential to the welfare of the Southwestern Power Administration.

At this point it might be well again to refer to Bonneville Power Administration as being the same type of agency as is the Southwestern Paper Administration, and yet even though Bonneville's continuing fund is limited to emergencies, they have been able to enter successfully into working agreements with REA's, municipalities, public-utility districts, private utilities, and private industrial users in the area.

I may say in that regard that, as is disclosed on page 47 of the Senate committee hearings, out of 56 contracts in Bonneville, 28 were with REA's and 16 were with public-utility districts, making a total of 44. So they were able to enter into all kinds of wheeling contracts with the REA's and all kinds of wheeling contracts with the public-utility districts.

Since August 20, 1937, the date of the creation of the Bonneville Power Administration and the continuing fund, Bonneville has been able to do the same things in the same manner that the Southwestern Power Administration

claims it cannot do without blanket authority through the continuing fund. This to me does not make any semblance of sense.

Mr. President, for the past several years the Southwestern Power Administration has testified that it is willing and anxious to enter into contracts with all the private utilities in its area. Yet it refuses even to negotiate with the utilities in southern Missouri, but, at the same time, is busy entering into lease and purchase agreements with super-co-ops in this area. The Senate Appropriation Committee was furnished letters from Mr. Douglas Wright to the private utilities in the southern Missouri area in which he stated he was not ready to negotiate for contracts and that even though such contracts might eventually be negotiated, the Southwestern Power Administration fully intended to proceed with all its plans in the area. In other words, Mr. President, the Southwestern Power Administration takes the position that it will negotiate contracts when it gets good and ready to do so, but that such contracts will not stand in the way of the expansion planned by using the continuing fund. This is a very startling position for a Government agency to take, in view of the constantly stated policy of the Congress—the constantly stated policy of the Congress and of this body, if you please—that it wants contracts to be negotiated between Government agencies and private companies; that it believes that Government agencies and private enterprise can exist and get along side by side; and that these contracts can save needless duplication and waste of critical materials. It appears that the time has come for the Congress to step in and regain control of this situation. Mr. President, if we maintain this continuing fund as we have, we will be losing day by day control of the situation, and in the end we will never recoup. Congress can only do so by limiting the use of this continuing fund and making the Southwestern Power Administration do business in exactly the same manner as the Bonneville Power Administration has been doing since 1937, and such as is proposed for the Southeastern Power Administration to do.

Mr. President, the basic authority for the Southwestern Power Administration, as well as the Southeastern Power Administration, is section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944. It might be well at this point to review the growth of the Southwestern Power Administration and look at the record of how and why section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 is worded as it is.

During the early thirties the Oklahoma Legislature created a State corporation known as the Grand River Dam Authority which was authorized to borrow money for the construction of dams, power plants, transmission lines, and related facilities in the State of Oklahoma. The Grand River Dam Authority proceeded to borrow \$25,000,000 from the Federal Works Agency to construct the Grand River Dam in northeastern Oklahoma.

During the late thirties the Army engineers, under authorization of the Congress, started construction on the Norfork Dam in northwestern Arkansas and a few years later the Denison Dam on the Red River between Oklahoma and Texas.

On November 19, 1941—Executive Order No. 8944—President Roosevelt, under his emergency powers, took possession of the State-owned Grand River Dam and ordered its operation by the Federal Works Agency. Douglas Wright was appointed administrator of the project. On June 19, 1943—Executive Order No. 9353—The President directed the Federal Works Agency to take over the power-marketing activities of the Norfork Dam, and on July 30, 1943—Executive Order No. 9366—he directed the Secretary of Interior to dispose of power generated at Denison Dam. This later order transferred control of Norfork and Grand River Dam to the Secretary of the Interior. On August 30, 1943—Executive Order No. 9373—another Presidential order directed the Secretary of the Interior to operate the three dams as an integrated system and create an agency to administer the dams "in such manner, upon such condition, and to such extent" as he deemed necessary to "fulfill the defense requirements of the United States." The Secretary of the Interior immediately set up the Southwestern Power Administration as an agency of the Interior Department.

The first supplemental National Defense Act for 1944—Public Law 216, Seventy-eighth Congress—approved December 23, 1943, carried an appropriation of \$135,000 for power-marketing activities of the Southwestern Power Administration. The bill also set up a continuing fund of \$100,000 to be placed to the credit of the Southwestern Power Administrator and subject to check by him "to defray emergency expenses and to insure continuous operation."

The following year saw enactment of the Flood Control Act of 1944. Section 5 authorized Interior to market hydroelectric power generated at flood-control projects constructed by the Army engineers. Although placed in the bill by the Senate, section 5 was substantially modified by the conferees. The most important limitation placed on the Senate amendment by the conferees was the requirement—and I invite the attention of the Senate to this language—that transmission lines constructed or obtained by purchase or other agreement should be financed from funds to be appropriated by the Congress.

The statement of the Members on the part of the House conferees made this comment regarding conference action:

This amendment of the Senate (sec. 5), as modified, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of electric energy generated at reservoir projects under control of the War Department not required in the operation of such projects; authorizes, from funds to be appropriated by the Congress, the construction, or acquisition by purchase or other agreement, of such transmission lines or related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated at such projects available in wholesale quantities on fair and reasonable

terms and conditions. (H. Rept. No. 2051, 78th Cong., p. 7.)

When the conference report was debated on the House floor, Representative Whittington, of Mississippi, chairman of the House Flood Control Committee and chairman of the House Conferees on the Flood Control bill, explained the joint House-Senate action on section 5, as follows:

As I have indicated, amendment No. 9 (sec. 5), as modified, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of electric energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department and not required in the operation of such projects. The Secretary of the Department of the Interior is authorized from appropriations to be made by Congress to construct or acquire by purchase or other agreement only such transmission lines and facilities as may be made necessary in order to make the power available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms. Congress retains control over the construction and acquiring of transmission lines and related facilities, inasmuch as funds must be provided hereafter by Congress for such lines and facilities. They may be constructed, but they can only be acquired by purchase or other agreement. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 12, 1944, p. 9282.)

I seem to be amusing the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I am sorry.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. It was not anything the Senator from Nevada said which caused the smile on my countenance. It was a thought with reference to Thomas Jefferson, once the Presiding Officer of the Senate, and a rule which he wrote, which we find in Jefferson's Manual. It may be that the Senator from Nevada prompted my thought as to Mr. Jefferson's rule.

Mr. McCARRAN. Assurance was given to the Congress of the United States that all transmission lines had to be appropriated for, and that these emergency funds were never set up for the purpose of acquiring facilities, but rather for the purpose of meeting emergencies, and emergencies only.

We followed that policy down the line to the present day. Today, under the bill we are considering, the Southeastern Power Administration is limited to \$50,000 a year which it may use, subject to the check of the Administrator, for emergency purposes. The great Bonneville project, into which the Government of the United States has poured millions of dollars, today is operating under that very language.

Later in the debate, in answer to a question by Representative Angell, Republican, of Oregon, Chairman Whittington reiterated Congress' control of Interior's purse strings in regard to acquiring or constructing transmission lines:

Mr. ANGELL. Am I correct in understanding that under the provisions as agreed upon by the conferees, the Secretary of the Interior has the power either to buy transmission facilities or construct them and dispose of power at wholesale?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; he has the power to construct or acquire by purchase or other

agreement, but the funds have to be provided by the Congress of the United States, and the Congress thus retains the purse strings of the Treasury.

I have read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 12, 1944, at page 9286.

It will undoubtedly be argued that the phrase "From funds to be appropriated by the Congress," and "funds * * * provided hereafter by Congress for such lines and facilities" mean permanent, indefinite appropriations as well as annual appropriations, since permanent appropriations are, in a general sense, congressional appropriations. This argument, however, was answered by Representative Whittington in testimony before the House Appropriations Committee on the Interior appropriation bill for 1947, Seventy-ninth Congress, part III, page 418, when he stated, regarding the power-marketing features of section 5 of the Flood Control Act:

It is my view that Congress, in line with its obligations, should provide an agency to dispose of the surplus power at dams which might be constructed under the Flood Control Act, primarily for the protection of the lives and property of the people of the country.

So, the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of this act is authorized to dispose of the surplus power in such manner as to dispose of it at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedule to be provided for as included in the conference report and in the act.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the following language:

I thought it was unwise, and it was not our intention, to give the Secretary of the Interior power to construct transmission lines and other related facilities from the income of the power sale, but to require him to come to Congress for the funds for the construction of transmission lines and other of the facilities.

I should like to read that paragraph again. It is worthy of memorizing:

I thought it was unwise, and it was not our intention, to give the Secretary of the Interior power to construct transmission lines and other related facilities from the income of the power sale, but to require him to come to Congress for the funds for the construction of transmission lines and other of the facilities.

I am reading from the hearings before the House Committee on Appropriations on the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1947, Seventy-ninth Congress, part III, page 418.

The fact that the Department of the Interior itself believed it was required to come to Congress for specific appropriations for its transmission lines is borne out further in the testimony of former Secretary of Interior Ickes before the Senate Commerce Committee on the Flood Control Act of 1944. The committee had previously written an amendment to the Rivers and Harbors Act setting up a blanket prohibition against the Federal Government constructing transmission lines directly or indirectly in competition with private companies. When questioned by the late Senator Overton,

of happy memory, subcommittee chairman, regarding the blanket "competition" amendment, Mr. Ickes stated:

It (the amendment) seems to me unnecessary, if I may say so, because if we should attempt to build or buy, we would have to come to Congress for an appropriation of money, so it could then be determined on the merits of the particular case.

I have read from the testimony before the Senate Committee on Commerce on H. R. 4485, Seventy-eighth Congress, page 453.

In addition, a memorandum on the authority of the Southwestern Power Administration to construct or acquire by purchase or other agreement transmission lines and steam-generating facilities, dated May 17, 1946, and submitted to the Federal Power Commission by Douglas Wright, Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration, under letter of same date stated:

The legislative record shows that the substituted language (section 5 as it now exists) worked out by Senator OVERTON and Mr. Goldschmidt and the subsequent additions thereto by the conference committee on the disagreeing votes of the House and Senate were intended and understood to differ from the original suggestion of President Roosevelt and Secretary Ickes only to the extent of (1) assuring that the acquisition of facilities by the Secretary of the Interior would be subject to control by the Congress through the appropriation procedure and that income from power would not be invested directly in power facilities; (2) assuring that the power was to be marketed in wholesale quantities and that the Government would not go into the distribution of power at retail; and (3) obviating the condemnation of facilities of the private utilities.

I have read from the hearings of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, on H. R. 4485, pages 803-813, and volume 90 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 8329, 9277, and 9259.

In November 1945, just 1 year after passage of the Flood Control Act, the Southwestern Power Administration published its "Comprehensive plan of power distribution and sales from hydroelectric projects as authorized by the Flood Control Act, December 1944 (H. R. 4485) in the Southwestern region." This plan provided for the construction of 15,000 miles of federally financed duplicating transmission lines and the initial installation of 260,000 kilowatts of steam power to be owned and operated by Southwestern Power Administration—all under the claimed authority granted by section 5 of the Flood Control Act.

Congress denied funds for most of Southwestern Power Administration's initial plan for the Southwest. Southwestern Power Administration was given only enough funds to interconnect the three hydro projects then operating in the Southwest, plus funds to construct some stub lines. Southwestern Power Administration was specifically informed that it had no authority to construct or operate steam plants.

When the bill was debated on the Senate floor, the chairman of the Interior Appropriation Subcommittee explained

the Southwestern Power Administration section as follows:

The argument was very firmly made throughout all the hearings by the committee that there was at the present time, in the opinion of the committee, no authority of law for building steam plants to firm up this power, and it was the judgment of the committee that if the power was to be firmed up by steam plants it should be done by appropriate legislation approved by the Congress.

That statement was made by the chairman of the subcommittee when speaking on the floor of the Senate and stating what was the sentiment of the Senate at that time.

He said further:

The issue here is, Shall three dams be connected together by a transmission line? * * *

* * * so far as the Appropriations Committee is concerned, not a member of it, to my knowledge, or the knowledge of the Senator from Oklahoma, says that it would be a commitment to build steam plants or to go any further than to connect these three dams together with a transmission line. That is all there is to it. Furthermore, if that program is to be carried out, it shall be done by legislation reported by an appropriate committee and not on an appropriation bill.

Mr. President, in 1947 and 1948 the Southwestern Power Administration received only operation expenses. During this period the agency requested an increase in the size of its continuing fund from \$100,000 to \$300,000, and requested that the fund be expanded to include the purchase of power and energy and the acquiring of transmission lines. On both these occasions Congress refused the Southwestern Power Administration's request. Testimony by the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration before the House Appropriations Committee indicated that this fund was necessary in order to operate under contracts such as the Texas contract. The Southwestern Power Administration repeated its request in 1949. The House approved the change, but the Senate Appropriations Committee rejected it, saying that "No law exists authorizing appropriations for such purposes."

In requesting expansion of the continuing fund on the Senate floor in August 1949, the impression was given that the continuing fund was necessary to work out contracts with the private companies. On two occasions it was stated that the sole purpose of the fund was to enable the Southwestern Power Administrator to make contracts with the private utility companies similar to the Texas Power & Light Co. contract.

Yet, Mr. President, as I have already pointed out, the Senate Appropriations Committee had before it testimony, from both private utilities that have already entered into contracts and from others who are trying to negotiate such contracts, that the continuing fund is not necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts. No, Mr. President, the continuing fund is not necessary to carry out wheeling contracts. And again I point to the contracts that have been entered

into by the Bonneville Power Administration; but the argument is made that it is necessary in its enlarged form. What is not stated, Mr. President, is that only by this device can the Southwestern Power Administration circumvent the will of Congress. Only by this method can its operating area be enlarged and enlarged. What started out as a modest marketing agency to market the power from a few Corps of Engineers dams will end up—unless Congress reestablishes its control—no one knows where, for by the device of expanding through the leasing of transmission facilities—with the further agreement to purchase—and the purchase of the output of steam generating plants that do not belong to the Southwestern Power Administration, the expansion and growth of this agency are limited only by the availability of lines to lease and purchase and steam plants from which to purchase the output, and all of this can be done without prior approval of the Congress, through the device of the continuing fund.

Mr. President, to emphasize again the point that the Southwestern Power Administration should not be treated any differently than any other power-marketing agency, I refer now to Senate Report No. 1754, on House bill 940, a bill authorizing construction of the Eklutna project, hydroelectric generating plant and transmission facilities in connection therewith. This bill was reported by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress. The Senate committee struck out all after the enacting clause and amended the bill. Section 2 of the Senate version of the bill contains this statement and, Mr. President, I ask all Senators to listen carefully to the statement issued only a few weeks ago by the Senate committee:

All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy generated at said project shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts, save and except that the Treasury shall set up and maintain from the receipts of said project a continuing fund of \$200,000 to the credit of the Secretary and subject to expenditure by him, to defray emergency expenses and to insure continuous operation.

I submit, Mr. President, that this is the exact language that was used in creating the Bonneville continuing fund. It is also of interest to note that the same report reproduces a letter from the Bureau of the Budget to the Secretary of the Interior, commenting as follows on a suggested draft of the bill drawn up by the department:

Such fund (referring to the proposed continuing language as drawn by the department) would be subject to expenditure by the Secretary to defray the operating expenses of generation and transmission of such power and energy, to defray emergency expenses, including expenses for such installations and connections as may be required to deliver power and energy from the transmission system, and to insure continuous operation. This provision is contrary to the existing Federal practice of defraying such operating expenses from funds appropriated by the Congress. Section 4 should be amended to limit the use of the continuing fund to emergency expenses required to in-

sure continuous operation of the system generally as presently employed by the Bonneville Power Administration.

The letter from which I have just quoted is dated July 1, 1949, and was sent to the Interior Department by the Bureau of the Budget a few weeks before the Southwestern Power Administration was successful in having the Congress do what the Bureau of the Budget had stated to the Department of the Interior would be in violation of existing Federal practice of paying these expenses out of funds appropriated by the Congress, rather than from receipts taken in.

Mr. President, the present Secretary of the Interior is making a sincere and quite successful effort to resolve the so-called power fight. However, there are some who serve under him who will not rest until the Federal Government has an absolute monopoly on all power produced in this country. I know that there are those who scoff at such an idea, but socialism is a creeping paralysis that destroys the will to resist and feeds on its own gains. The time has come for Congress to resolve the issue by reestablishing its control over the public moneys and fulfilling its constitutional prerogatives of a complete and annual review of all Federal expenditures. The time to start is now. The way to start is by adopting the committee amendment on the Southwestern Power Administration continuing fund.

Mr. MONRONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. KERR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to inquire of the distinguished chairman of the committee what his intentions are about asking for a vote on the pending amendment tonight.

Mr. HAYDEN. In view of the lateness of the hour, I think it would be well to recess until tomorrow, at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma, and to vote on the amendment following the reconvening of the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Two or three Senators had inquired as to what the intention is.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is our intention to ask for a vote on the amendment, immediately after the Senate reconvenes tomorrow. The point of order can be made then.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I regret deeply the fact that the arrangements which have been made throughout the southwest, particularly in the State of Oklahoma, to work out a feasible, equitable, and fair method of bringing a supply of electricity for the use of preferred customers, the Government, the REA cooperatives, and municipalities, will be so gravely damaged, as it will, by the adoption of the amendment reported by the committee, which would strike out the \$300,000 continuing fund which the Senate, 2 years ago, in its wisdom, enacted. This \$300,000 continuing fund is the basis for much of the progress we have made in the State of Oklahoma in trying to bring about an equitable solution of the proper disposal of Federal power. If we adopt the amendment of the committee I am sure we shall do violence to contracts entered into with private utilities and also with the REA generating and transmission cooperatives which have worked to help improve and to better the supply of power.

In order to make it crystal clear that the Secretary of Interior had the authority to purchase steam-generated electricity to firm up its hydroelectric power, and to lease lines for transmission, it was specifically provided in last year's bill under this language: "and said fund of \$300,000 shall be placed to the credit of the Secretary, and shall be subject to check by him to defray emergency expenses necessary to insure continuity of electric service and continuous operation of the facilities, and to cover all costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy and rentals for the use of facilities for the transmission and distribution of electric power and energy to public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies."

With approval of this principle and the assurance of the \$300,000 continuing fund with which to buy power and lease lines, the SPA under congressional directive has gone forward in making its contracts work. The Oklahoma contract with the two big Oklahoma private utilities was hailed as a model and acclaimed by both private and public power interests as an example of how both could work together in full cooperation. But this contract depends upon the \$300,000 continuing fund. Without it the contract will not work.

Contracts made also with REA generation and transmission cooperatives, under this same section of the bill, also will be invalidated. The purchase of power from both private utilities and cooperatives, as well as the leasing of certain transmission lines, will be ruled out completely under the language on page 4 of this bill.

Thus this program that offered so much hope and was destined to insure an adequate power supply for the REA cooperatives of the entire Southwest through use of private REA and public lines will be brought to an abrupt end.

This \$300,000 continuing fund is not an expense item. This money can be spent only as electric power is purchased or as payments are due for lease of

transmission lines. As the money is spent for this service and power purchases, other money flows back into the United States Treasury.

Not one thin dime comes from any other source than the income which is derived from the continuing fund to buy power.

Power cannot be stored. It must be sold, and as the payments are made for it, the money is returned to the Treasury. For \$300,000 spent for the purchase of electricity, from \$700,000 to \$800,000 can flow back into the Treasury.

If this purchase of steam power cannot be made, to firm up the hydropower, then much of the hydropower would have to be disposed of at dump-energy rates at a fraction of its worth as firm usable power. The effect of killing the continuing fund would be to withdraw from the Secretary of Interior the right to market his power at the best possible rates by firming it up with purchases of steam power.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator mentioned the \$300,000 fund. Will he explain how it operates? I am told by some persons that they interpret it to mean that the \$300,000 can be used in many different ways; that is, that it may be spent for transmission lines, and then \$300,000 may be accumulated in addition and can be used for some other authorized purpose.

Mr. MONRONEY. The money can be spent only for the purchase of power or for the lease or rental of facilities. It would not be turned over more than once a month, at the most. The money comes back from the sale of power which has been bought from the utilities or the cooperatives.

Mr. STENNIS. When the money comes back, what is done with it?

Mr. MONRONEY. It is turned into the Treasury. It is a constant continuing fund which is replenished.

Mr. STENNIS. So that when the returns come in from the investment of the \$300,000, the money goes into the Treasury?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. Whatever amount has been spent is replaced. If \$100,000 is spent in 1 month, and perhaps \$300,000 comes in, \$100,000 of that amount will go into the Treasury.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. Various wild schemes were advanced in the hearings by private utility witnesses who sought to prove that the continuing fund could be killed without affecting the purchase of power from the private utilities. These included "payment in kind" or a completely balanced interchange of power between SPA and the utilities.

That is practically an impossibility. It has been compared with the Texas Power & Light Co. contract, but it is entirely dissimilar. Under the Oklahoma contract, we buy much steam-generated power from utility companies, and the balances must be settled each month.

It seems highly doubtful if the Comptroller General will approve dealing in kilowatts instead of money and other ad-

ministrative difficulties make this plan impossible of achievement.

Another argument was that Congress could appropriate each year the money SPA would require for its power purchases. With budgets made up 14 to 18 months ahead of use, with demand loads unpredictable, and with water supplies uncertain for hydro generation, this offers an objectionable and fantastic detour to kill off the simple and effective continuing fund operation.

I might say, Mr. President, that there is nothing mysterious about the continuing-fund operation. It is not a well-kept secret. The Administrator has to come before the Appropriations Committees and explain the conditions every year. The operation is reported to the Budget Bureau, and it is closely and carefully watched. Any time Congress feels that the continuing fund is being abused, it has the power, as it always has the power, to control the operation, to modify the terms, or to withdraw it completely. I think that now is a poor time, as we start on the task of working out the Oklahoma contract to deliver through private-utility companies' lines cheap Government power, to buy steam-generated power from them. I think it is a poor time to start to wreck the program.

The hearings reveal, rather clearly I think, that the only objective to this killing of the continuing fund is to eliminate the purchases of power from the REA generating cooperatives and the lease of their transmission lines. It was these contracts that received the brunt of the attack in the hearings from the private-utility witnesses. They were willing even to risk striking down the model contract with the private utilities in order to kill off the arrangements made for a small amount of power from the generating and transmission co-ops.

There is nothing new about generating and transmission co-ops in REA. Out of more than \$2,000,000,000 in REA loans \$423,863,488 has been advanced Nation-wide for this type of operation. That is less than one-fifth of total loan authorizations.

The Oklahoma contract with SPA was signed by the two large utility companies with full knowledge of the negotiations with these co-ops. Yet one witness testified that he feared that the cooperatives having steam generation would destroy the contract in 5 years.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that the Western Electric Co-op was negotiating with the Rural Electrification Administration in Washington for the funds with which to build their steam plant in western Oklahoma at the same time that SPA was negotiating with the private utilities to enter into this contract?

Mr. MONRONEY. Exactly; and they were fully advised and knew all about the likelihood of the contract being accepted, and with that in mind signed, and hailed as a great achievement, this Oklahoma type of contract, which was the result of that bargaining.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. KERR. Is it not further the fact that the Oklahoma utilities urged the Rural Electrification Administration in Washington to go ahead and complete the loan to the Western Electric Co-op in Oklahoma to build that generating plant so that any doubt of its being built might be removed from the minds of Oklahoma REA's, and thereby they would not become uneasy about this contract which the Oklahoma utilities were so anxious to have signed?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is better advised about that than I. But there is no question that they knew of these negotiations, and the likelihood of their completion at the time they signed this model contract. I believe the Senate knew about it, because in re-reading the hearings when the committee considered the Kerr amendment which gave the Secretary the right to buy steam power and to lease the facilities, I find it was said by the then senior Senator from Oklahoma that these contracts for transmission lines were being entered into, and the Senate was surely on notice and was certainly advised that it was a part of the general operation at the time it agreed to the Kerr amendment to that bill.

The witness for the utility companies based his claim that these contracts would destroy the private utilities upon the fact that the cooperatives have steam-generating capacity which would run the private utility companies out of business.

Let us look at the record on that one. Contracts have been signed with seven generating and transmitting co-ops. These provide for the lease of certain high-voltage transmission lines and also provide for the purchase of power generated by four of them. The other three generate no power whatsoever. They merely attempt to serve rural areas which have not had adequate transmission line service.

After the contract is in full operation, in 3 or 4 years, the SPA will, in purchasing their output, buy 115,000 kilowatts. But in turn they will be selling them 259,500. In other words, they will be selling more than twice as much as they buy from them. Does this sound like enough electricity to interfere with their contracts with the private power companies.

In annual kilowatt-hours SPA will purchase a total of 837,000,000 and will sell them 1,135,810,000 kilowatt-hours or buy only 70 percent as much energy as they sell them each year.

In addition to this small amount of power purchased from these REA coops, the SPA leases their high-voltage transmission lines. These co-op lines were designed specifically to render efficient and reliable service to their REA members at their load centers. Thus it would make for good engineering in these farm systems, which in the past have had to depend solely upon private power lines which were designed for city load centers—not farm load centers. These lines would take the power where

needed, while existing lines often are many miles away from the load centers of the rural co-ops.

That is an important consideration in trying to get these lines into the country where the power is needed because the load lines that REA is often charged with duplicating go far beyond the rural-line centers. They were not built with anything like the rural demand in mind, and it has only been an afterthought, so far as the private utilities are concerned, because their big money, their big market, their big interest is and will continue to be within the metropolitan areas where they still operate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. In connection with the statement made by the Senator from Oklahoma, I was very much interested in reading the hearings on this bill to find a statement by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] refreshing our recollection of the fact that when Congress passed the NIRA bill back in 1933 that bill not only dealt with the national industrial recovery program, but it also carried certain public works appropriations to provide for the construction of projects to give people jobs. The Administration at that time offered certain of the public works funds to power companies, asking them to take those funds and build rural lines with them. The answer was, "The farmers are getting all the power they can pay for now." The implication strongly was that the farmers were getting all the power they needed. The public utilities were organized with the idea of serving the cities and the big markets, so to speak, instead of stringing out lines into sparsely settled rural areas.

So, the Senator from Oklahoma is exactly right in what he is saying. The utilities have not been disposed to go into the rural areas; they have not found that it would be profitable for them to do so. They have set up their systems, not with the view of going into the rural areas, but with the view of serving the cities and the towns where the large markets exist.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his statement. In other words, the service to the rural co-ops is a byproduct. The private utilities are not organized for and it is not their intention or their purpose to serve rural co-ops. But, Mr. President, it is our business, because we have put more than \$2,000,000,000 in loans in the REA's. The continuing adequate supply of low-cost power where needed and when needed is our responsibility, because we put up \$2,000,000,000 to build the lines which the private utilities said were impossible to build and make work. Yet the farmers of the country have proved that they could build them and make them work. Do not tell me that is an invasion of the enterprise of the private utilities.

We have \$2,000,000,000 invested in lines built years ago. They were not built by Government workers. They

were built by small contractors who went into every nook and cranny of the country and undertook to build \$2,000,000,000 worth of lines. Those lines would not have been built had it not been for the action of Congress, which overrode the objections which were made against appropriations for such purposes. Had Congress listened to the objections which were made against the building of such lines there would have been no REA's. We have an obligation, Mr. President, to see to it that these lines are supplied with low-cost power, because we built that market and we are on the back of the paper for those REA loans. I think we should be more concerned in seeing to it that we secure adequate service to the REA's than with whether one line or two lines may perhaps constitute what a private utility man says is a duplication and represent an interference with his transmitting system.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not also true that many of the REA contracts were consummated with certain pledges or plans in mind on the part of the Government; for example, a contract which was made for the building of a generating plant on the basis that a certain amount of the power would be used in a wheeling system, or an arrangement to firm up some power with the hydroelectric power and thereby divert that back into the REA distribution system?

What the Senator is driving at, I assume, is that in many of these contracts there is an arrangement with the Federal Government, in terms of federally purchased power so as to benefit the users of REA.

Mr. MONRONEY. Of course. Without the contract with the SPA a local REA generating cooperative would be denied the very preference right which it enjoys with respect to the power generated at dams. I cannot see how any Senator could criticize connecting up the SPA with REA generating and transmission lines, because if they are not connected, we are saying, "Because you are a part of the REA system we are not going to let you buy any low-cost hydro power." They must be connected if they are to get the advantage of the law which has been in force for years. Congress says that they are entitled to that power. Why should the Southwestern Power Administration be criticized for helping to integrate the REA generating and transmission systems when the law says that they are the preferred customers? I do not think it makes sense. I think Congress is being led down the wrong line of thinking. Our thinking should be toward the supply of REA cooperatives, and to see that they get the power.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oklahoma has just stated that the REA is one of the preference customers. Let us consider for a moment the term "preference." That preference is created by an act of Congress.

Mr. MONRONEY. Under an act of Congress, we must sell to them first.

Mr. HUMPHREY. With respect to the particular amendment to which the Senator directs his remarks, if the continuing or revolving fund is denied, or if the authority for that fund is removed, is it not true that the preference customer becomes a preference customer only in theory, and is not permitted to be a preference customer in fact?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Minnesota is correct. The preference customers then become the private utilities operating in the neighborhood of the dams. The power can go only to them if we deny the \$300,000 continuing fund. We cannot run our power over the utility lines. We cannot serve the REA's. We shall have to dump that power, which today we sell for 6.4 mills, to the private utility buyers as dump power, at 1 1/4 mills.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator has aptly pointed out that what this proposal amounts to is a reversal of policy. The preference customer is no longer a preference customer. The private utility becomes the No. 1 customer, and the only preferred customer.

Mr. MONRONEY. He is the only one able to take the power.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is there not yet another point with reference to the revolving fund and the program to which the Senator directs his attention? The REA's in the particular area to which the Senator is referring, as I understand, have invested a sizable amount of money in a generation and transmission system.

Mr. MONRONEY. They have invested the money in good faith, believing that Congress knew what it was doing, and that it would not suddenly reverse its policy completely. I have in mind a particular REA generating cooperative in the western part of Oklahoma. It has spent about \$4,000,000 on transmission lines and power generation. Another one, in the northeastern part of the State, near the power "desert," is now undergoing construction. If Congress is going to reverse its policy without notice, after having made these contracts in good faith, of course the result will be as described. We can get out of them under an escape clause. The losers will be the REA cooperatives and the REA itself, which guarantees the loans. The result will certainly be a great waste of public money.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator speaks of the cooperatives in Oklahoma which have made large investments. I understand that Central Electric Cooperative of Missouri has also invested some \$4,000,000, acting on what it felt was the good faith of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Am I not correct in assuming that if the committee amendment prevails it will be impossible for the Southwestern Power Administration to carry out its contracts with the rural

electrification units, or at least that its ability to provide power for the rural electrification units will be greatly curtailed under any circumstances?

Mr. MONRONEY. It would practically wreck the entire program. The REA units could not buy the steam power necessary to firm up the hydro power.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that for many years the furtherance of rural electrification has been one of the fundamental policies of the Federal Government?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. If that be the case, would not the proposed amendment be definitely a step backward, and would it not retard the development rather than advance it?

Mr. MONRONEY. It certainly would, because the load on REA lines in REA distributing cooperatives doubles every 5 years. The farmers are canny. They are used to trading. They know that the lines overhead are not going to be worth anything unless they have a dependable power supply which will energize them. They worry about the increasing load, because in so many places they are faced with the answer, "We have no power to sell," or "We are going to have to limit you to so much," or "We are going to have to put other restrictions in the contract." Under the program of the SPA for the first time the farmers of the Southwest have felt secure in their ability to have, at long last, an ample supply of power at low rates, in order to make the REA work as the farmers dreamed it should work.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe it was about 2 years ago that the Senator's colleague, the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], offered an amendment which provided for the continuing or revolving fund.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was for the express purpose of seeing to it that the private utility, the Government power agency, and the REA facility all worked together and were tied into a common network or pooling arrangement, so that there would be the maximum utilization of power. Is not that true?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct; and the Record, when that amendment was adopted, so shows.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that if the revolving or continuing fund is done away with, there may actually be a loss of the power which would ordinarily be available—in other words, of the firm power, the kind of power which can be used 24 hours a day?

Mr. MONRONEY. Certainly. There would be no way of firming it up. The continuing fund is the money which buys the steam power which firms up the hydroelectric power. In our part of the country it must be firm up with steam power.

The distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] was comparing our part of the country with Bonneville. If we had the water of the Columbia River, or if we had the hydro capacity which

Bonneville has, we would not need to have any continuing fund; but we must buy steam-generated electricity to have the power to sell on the line.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, some of the Government dams have, on an average, only 18 percent of firm power. In other words, only 18 percent of the power at a particular dam is available everyday throughout the year.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. So what we must do is to firm up that 18 percent. It is my understanding that on the Bonneville project the average is not 18 percent, but about 80 percent. So that represents an entirely different picture. The fact of the matter is that any time we have held hearings with relation to power, if there was any one thing which stood out, it was the fact that the Columbia River was a wonderful river. There is a constant flow everyday throughout the year. There is a much more favorable situation on the Columbia River than we have in the Southwest or in the Southeast.

I have had it brought home to me in connection with the TVA. People say, "Why are not the TVA rates as low as Bonneville rates?" The difference is represented in the difference of flow as between the two rivers. The Columbia River has a steady flow, and the Tennessee River has a much more variable flow. In the area under the jurisdiction of the Southwestern Power Administration steam power must be bought to firm up the hydro power.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think we need to get this issue out in the open as clearly as possible. It seems to me that the revolving fund makes it possible to have the maximum utilization of all the power which is generated, whether it is what we call firm power or secondary power. It makes it possible to utilize it to the fullest capacity.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If we do away with the revolving fund, will it not mean that aside from the so-called hydroelectric power about which the Senator from Alabama has been talking, which is only about 18 percent firm power, the remainder will be what we call dump power, which will go to the private utility at any price it wants to pay for it?

Mr. MONRONEY. Usually about one and a quarter mills.

Mr. HUMPHREY. About one and a quarter or one and a half mills. In turn, by the use of a little steam power, the public utility could get anywhere from 6 to 7 or 8 or 9 mills for it, from the Federal Government hydroelectric power project, which would then become merely an agency or unit of the private company, and not an agency of the REA cooperatives or the preferred customers.

Mr. MONRONEY. That would be entirely possible. In other words, it would

be possible to use the generating facilities around the clock, if they were interconnected with SPA. If they were to serve only one cooperative they would be used only 50 percent of the time, and there would be involved a higher cost of generation and completely inefficient operation.

By purchasing the firm power generated by the four REA generating and transmission co-ops, and by leasing their lines, these rural systems will be interconnected so that full utilization of their generating capacity and their transmission lines will be utilized.

If this interconnection is good business and engineering for the private utilities, then why is it not just as good for these REA plants and systems?

Much has been made of the fact that steam-generated power will be purchased by SPA from these four REA plants. If it is good business and proper management to purchase steam power from the private utilities, would it not be just as proper to purchase some small amount of power from these plants as well? Or should the private utilities be given an absolute monopoly on the supply of steam-generated electricity? While the contracts to purchase differ in some degree, the principal of the purchase and sale of power between the two is the same.

The law which Congress passed last year did not direct the Secretary of the Interior to buy only from the private power companies.

There is nothing new about these generating and transmission REA co-ops. They have been in operation throughout the country almost since the inception of REA in 1937. Their numbers have grown as the loads have grown on rural lines, and the need for a better supply of rural power to serve the ever-increasing demand of farm users made itself felt. REA loans for this purpose are well under one-fifth of the total REA loan authorizations thus far made.

I may say that in the debate earlier today it was indicated that the generating and transmission co-ops were organized as a part of a scheme to circumvent Congress. The Western Electric Cooperative in my State was organized in 1940 or 1941, long before Mr. Wright came to Oklahoma. The Kamo project, in the northeastern part of Oklahoma, was organized before World War II, long before Mr. Wright came to Oklahoma. Some of the others, particularly the Sho-Me Co-op, have been operating, as the distinguished Senator knows, where no other services are possible in Missouri. It is not new, and it is not a part of any scheme to circumvent Congress. It is merely the common-sense linking together of the facilities of private, REA, and public power that we have in that area, in order to get the power to the farmers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Any insinuation to the effect that the construction of generating facilities by an REA is an effort to circumvent Congress literally flies in the face of the facts. There have been

repeated attempts made in Congress, in the form of amendments, to deny REA co-ops the right to build generating facilities. Congress has repeatedly turned down such attempts.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Congress has recognized in the REA program that, while the basis should be distribution, in order to have distribution at some place it may be necessary to have generation, and, therefore, the generating facilities provision has always been a part of the REA program. Is that not correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is entirely correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In short, to destroy the REA generating facilities, as a part of the distribution system, is an open knock-out blow against the whole program of REA; is it not?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is certainly true. To deny them the right to connect up with a system distributing hydroelectric power is utterly preposterous. It is turning the law completely around to deny preference customers, because they are preference customers, the right to such power.

Congress knew all about the generation and transmission needs of cooperatives. Two full investigative studies were made only last year by the subcommittee on appropriations of both Houses, in answer to complaints filed by the private utilities companies. In the complaints they asked Congress to prohibit this type of loan. The subject was gone over very carefully by the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture in the House, and I believe by both committees in the Senate. They had the testimony before them and they went over it, and no action was taken to prohibit this activity. So I do not believe it comes in any good time now to say that this was some sort of slick trick to circumvent Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very much interested in the generating facilities, because it seems to me that there is almost a plot or conspiracy to undermine the economic solvency of the REA, because if the REA facilities are not permitted to tie together, in order to get the benefit of their hydroelectric power, which can be made available and firmed up with some steam power, it would force the REA cooperatives to go deeper and deeper into debt in an effort to build generating facilities.

Mr. MONRONEY. It would be less economical and less successful. The use of hydroelectric power makes possible operation at a profit. It would not be impossible for them to operate at a profit or on an even keel if we were to set them apart in one corner and say, "It is all right for everyone else to interconnect, but you must not do so."

Mr. HUMPHREY. If we do not permit them to interconnect the only alternative they would have would be to try to construct enough generating facilities at the load center to take care of their customers within that area, which

would mean that there would be an excess capacity in perhaps a half dozen areas, which would never be used because of no interconnection.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is exactly correct. As one section grows it is possible to pipe in, so to speak, electricity from another section without need for further construction of generating facilities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The reason I speak as I do is because 16 cooperatives in my own State were before the appropriations subcommittee to testify to exactly what the Senator from Oklahoma is bringing out. We have six generating facilities. In those six generating facilities we have a power deficit in three areas and a power surplus in three other areas. Because we do not have any interconnecting lines there is no way by which we can use a power surplus in one area to take care of a power deficit in another area. The only thing we can do is to have a great expenditure of extra money to build up the deficit in one area, while at the same time we are not able to put to full use the surplus in another area. Under a program such as the Senator from Oklahoma is referring to, we would be able to tie in and get the benefits which the Senator's State now enjoys. On the other hand, if the amendment is adopted it would deny such a program to Oklahoma, and the Senator's State would be paying from 13 to 15 mills, instead of 5 or 6 mills.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, who is making such a splendid presentation of the case, whether or not some of the persons who are advocating cutting off the program, which would, as the Senator from Minnesota says, make necessary the construction of new dams, are the same persons who continue to urge us to reduce the expenditures of the Government?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. President, there can be no question of the right of the REA generating and transmission co-ops to serve other REA distribution co-ops in their areas. But the objection is raised when they are linked together for better and more efficient operation by SPA into an integrated power grid that will permit the maximum use of their generating facilities at the lowest possible cost basis.

By the use of integrated transmission lines, a fully effective and well-engineered system can be maintained to take power to many places throughout the Southwest where no adequate transmission lines now exist in rural areas, and where today power shortages prevent expansion of present systems to achieve maximum farm coverage.

The success of this program of providing adequate power when and where needed for these farm electric systems depends upon this continuing fund, both to make the contracts with the private utility companies work, and to provide for the purchase and sale of power from these REA co-ops.

The claim that this program will destroy private enterprise is ridiculous. This load that SPA is seeking to serve was not built by private enterprise. It was built by Government loans to REA, and was built by small towns owning and operating their own electrical distribution systems. None of the customers created by the private utility companies will be affected by these lines nor plants.

The plain fundamental fact involved is whether special privilege will be extended by edict and order of this Congress to the private utility companies now fighting this program.

The Government has spent hundreds of millions of dollars in building flood-control dams and the hydroelectric plants that are a part of them. These dams cover up land that was taken away from the farmers for public use. The money that built them came from all the taxpayers. The power they generate has been for years wisely earmarked for use that would benefit the public—not monopoly.

To turn over exploitation of this Government investment in hydroelectric plants to two or three private utilities, for them to reap an exorbitant profit off of Government investment, is special privilege at its worst.

Yet if the Senate today cripples this program of transmitting this Government generated power to the preferred users, the Senate will invite such exploitation, and will wind up at the bus bar philosophy to force the sale of Government power at dump rates for a pittance, while the preferred customers buy it back from the private utilities at a high rate.

It seems to me that with millions of dollars of Government money invested in hydroelectric generation at the dams, and with hundreds of millions of dollars of Government money loaned to the REA's to develop a completely new electric market, now to give the private utilities an exclusive toll bridge between these two—with Government power at one end, with the Government-built market at the other end, and with the private utility serving as a toll bridge between the two, and collecting from both ends—would be a breach of our responsibilities as a Congress.

These preferred customers—the REA's, the towns owning their own distribution systems—are entitled to the service we have long promised them. They are entitled to some security on their power supply, such as that provided by the program Congress passed last year.

I do not want to see us put a big stick into the hands of a few private utility companies so that they can dictate all the terms and all the conditions in dealing with these public bodies for their future power supply.

The best way that we can prevent this monopoly of power supply from crippling both the power generation program and the REA systems is to maintain a small amount of power—power not under the monopolistic control of the few private power companies in their area—to give them effective bargaining power for their supply, service and rates.

In last year's bill the Senate gave them this guaranty that they would not be solely dependent upon the power companies. It made provision for the building of lines by appropriating money if—and I repeat the word "if"—a contract could not be worked out with the Oklahoma companies. With the right to build the line approved, the SPA was able then to negotiate as an equal for the contract with Oklahoma companies. As a result, this widely hailed contract was signed, and the \$6,000,000 appropriated for the SPA line was turned back to the Treasury, as the SPA said would be done if the contract were made.

Government power, REA power, and private power can live together under the type of contract worked out on the Oklahoma plan. There will be enough demand for electricity in the southwest area and throughout the country to insure a big market for the private utility companies and for their continued prosperity and expansion. There must also be some supply of power that will guarantee to these smaller cooperatives and municipal systems that they, too, will have a chance to obtain some of the benefits of these public expenditures for power generation.

THE COST OF CONTROLS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, recently the Senate considered a controls measure. At that time many of us thought, and we still think, that that bill was a good one. It gives ample power and authority to control many of the inflationary trends if those charged with the authority would devote as much time and effort to the administration of the power given to them by the Congress as they devote in seeking to grasp for themselves, more and more over-all power and controls.

Mr. President, in this connection we should consider some of the experiences we had during World War II. Let us bear them in mind when we consider the question of what controls entail.

I am interested in a statement which I received a few days ago, which points out most vividly some of the developments of which we should be very fully aware. It was during the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress that the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] submitted on February 11, 1943, Document No. 4, a report of the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. This particular report delved into the existing methods of all the Government departments and bureaus in respect to the manner and form of questionnaires, reports, and so forth, which businessmen throughout the Nation were required to fill out under the wartime controls then in effect.

The report indicates that a total of 7,025 reports were required from the public by 34 offices and agencies of the Federal Government.

The report pointed out the following defects in the forms sent out:

First, the purpose and use of many forms were not clear.

Second, identical information was requested by several of the Government agencies.

Third, many of the questions were couched in language too technical for the small-business man. That is the hue and cry with which many of us are confronted today.

Fourth, the forms were not prepared with a view of saving the businessman or the Government time and money, and in many instances were prepared without regard to the accounting practices of the particular industry concerned.

Fifth, where the purpose of the form was clear, many superfluous questions were added.

Sixth, the investigation conducted by the committee indicated that many of the reports served no useful purpose, that a great many of them were filed away by the Government agencies, and that the information contained in them was not subsequently tabulated.

Mr. President, one company furnished the committee with information that the added cost of personnel and stationery required to fill out the forms demanded by the Government amounted to \$192,500, presumably for 1 year.

On the basis of the present employment, if the Congress votes to extend the controls as requested by the President, it is safe to assume that the total man-days of employment which will be diverted from the productive effort to the filling out of bureaucratic forms will, on the basis of 4,500,000 concerns in the United States, be not less than 1 day a month for each concern, or 4,500,000 man-days in all, every month, or 54,000,000 man-days a year.

The man-days lost to production therefore would be approximately 10 percent less than the total unemployment in the Nation for the average during the year 1950, when such unemployment averaged 5,010,000 man-days a month.

With a crying need for manpower, the Congress should give this fact careful consideration.

Then, too, there is the matter of cost to the taxpayers, both direct and indirect. Where the costs are passed along to the consumer, as they generally are, the effect is directly the opposite of what many of the bureau heads say they need

controls to do, namely, reduce the cost of living and prevent inflation.

Many contend that controls, as contemplated, are themselves highly inflationary in character.

Mr. President, we have not had the time, as is pointed out in an article I have received, to make a study of the costs during World War II. However, from the number of employees hired for OPA, the Economic Stabilization Board, and other stabilization or special agencies, it is a safe bet that the total costs to the Government and to the business economy amount or will amount to approximately \$1,000,000,000 a year. As the article points out, we hope someone will very quickly challenge that estimate.

All this occurs at a time when wholesale commodity prices have dropped a total of 11.8 percent since February 17, 1951.

Mr. President, these are matters for the Congress and those who have asked for congressional consideration of additional control measures to ponder.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 10, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 7 (legislative day of June 27), 1951:

CHILDREN'S BUREAU

Martha M. Eliot, of Connecticut, to be Chief of the Children's Bureau, Federal Security Agency, vice Katharine F. Lenroot, retired.

HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Kenneth G. Heisler, of Washington, to be a member of the Home Loan Bank Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1953, vice Oscar Kent LaRoque, resigned.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATOR

Manly Fleischmann, of New York, to be Defense Production Administrator, vice William H. Harrison, resigned.

IN THE ARMY

Gen. Wade Hampton Haislip, O3374, Vice Chief of Staff, United States Army (major

general, U. S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Lt. Gen. John Edwin Hull, O7377, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Vice Chief of Staff, United States Army, with the rank of general and as general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Lt. Gen. James Alward Van Fleet, O3847, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as commanding general, Eighth Army, with the rank of general and as general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Lt. Gen. Alfred Maximilian Gruenther, O12242, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Chief of Staff, Supreme Headquarters, Allied Powers, Europe, with the rank of general and as general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Lt. Gen. Joseph May Swing, O3801 (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as commanding general, Sixth Army, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Maj. Gen. Andrew Davis Bruce, O5857, United States Army, for appointment as commandant, Armed Forces Staff College, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Maj. Gen. Maxwell Davenport Taylor, O14398, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Administration, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Maj. Gen. Anthony Clement McAuliffe, O12263, United States Army, for appointment as Assistant Chief of Staff, G-1, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Maj. Gen. Lewis Andrew Pick, O8096, United States Army, to be lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

depth in which they could organize and deploy armies and a large population which they could enslave and press into military service. Southern Korea and the nations which are pledged to defend it would therefore be forced to live in constant suspense under the continuing threat of a further Communist attack at a time opportune to them.

But at this point someone is likely to object that officials of the United Nations would be able to inspect the area north of the boundary and either prevent such Communist forces from being built up or give us ample warning if they were.

This I submit is a fantasy. The Communists have never permitted UN inspectors or agents within their borders. They did not permit them inside the Balkans, and in North Korea itself they refused to let the UN electoral representatives get an inch north of the thirty-eighth parallel. Whenever and wherever the Communists take over, they lower the iron curtain and there is no ingress.

Even if they agreed to such international inspection as a condition of the cease-fire, we could not rely on their keeping this agreement, without a UN army of occupation north of the thirty-eighth degree line to enforce it. In the meantime we would have laid down our arms and it would be hard to take them up again. I believe it would be much harder to persuade our UN associates and our own people to start enforcement operations should the Communists violate an inspection agreement than it would be to hold out for a more defensible line now while our forces are still in the field.

II. The second weakness of the thirty-eighth parallel is that it is almost impossible to defend. It is a wholly artificial line approximately 150 miles long with few or no topographical strong points for defense. It would require a considerable number of well-armed divisions to furnish an adequate defense. The thirty-eighth parallel, therefore, has nothing to recommend it from a military point of view. It was chosen in 1945 either accidentally or because it had previously marked the zone of influence of Czarist Russia. Since we are still determined to resist aggression and have had conclusive proof of the danger of such aggression from North Korea, we cannot content ourselves in restoring the indefensible former line in the pious hope the Communists will not do it again.

III. But, most important of all, the adoption of the thirty-eighth parallel as the dividing line would inevitably be turned into a great propaganda victory for the Chinese Communists. They would proclaim throughout Asia that they had driven our forces and those of the UN from our positions of last November back to the thirty-eighth parallel and that they had won a crushing victory. Instead of losing face, they would gain it. This is of crucial importance in the Orient and would undoubtedly help to swing tens of millions into the Communist camp.

Our prestige is already being weakened by sending emissaries under the protection of the white flag into the Communist-held town of Kaesong to negotiate a truce. These men have been frequently photographed by the Communist news photographers who were on hand and posters of their entrance will soon be distributed all over Asia. Since the white flag is the symbol of surrender as well as of a truce, such photographs will be hailed in the absence of other facts as proof positive that the Chinese Communists have won, and we have lost, the war in Korea. I want to make it clear that I do not say that an armistice at the thirty-eighth parallel would actually be a defeat. But I do want to emphasize that it will be so interpreted in Asia, and by some elements in our own country.

For all these reasons, I submit that in the long-run interests of peace and of preventing the renewal of aggression there, we should not make the thirty-eighth parallel the dividing line between the two forces, but that it should, if possible, be fixed appreciably to the north of this.

I would tentatively suggest (1) that the line should run across the so-called "neck" of Korea, approximately 100 miles north of the thirty-eighth and between Anshu and Eiko; (2) that the power plants on the south bank of the Yalu River and the transmission lines through Korea should at the same time be put under UN control; and (3) that in the long run, we should strive for a completely united Korea free of any outside domination, which was the objective of the UN before the aggression.

The advantages of such an arrangement and more particularly of the more northerly line of division are obvious. (1) In the first place, it would restore the vast proportion of the territory and the people of Korea to a unified country. At least four-fifths of the population would be under UN protection, and this proportion would be still further raised as the North Koreans would come out of the hills to live under the greater security and freedom enjoyed by those in the non-Communist section. It would be far less possible, therefore, for the Chinese Communists to force appreciable numbers of Koreans into their armed forces. Their military strength would be greatly weakened, and if they attacked southward again they could not effectively pretend that they were leading a Korean army of liberation.

(2) The "neck" as the narrowest part of the whole Korean Peninsula, is far more defensible from a military standpoint than is the thirty-eighth parallel. It is, for example, approximately only 90 miles long as compared to 150 miles at the thirty-eighth parallel. It can, therefore, be held with fewer divisions, and a smaller total force can provide greater defense in depth. While no line can be fixed that will eliminate all future risks, the line at the neck seems best devised to minimize those risks.

(3) Only such a line or one still further to the north would permit our helping in the economic and social reconstruction of Northern as well as Southern Korea which Senator Flanders has advocated in a most statesmanlike and Christian speech. For we cannot reconstruct territory which is under the military occupation of the Communists.

(4) Finally and most important of all, it would prove to all Asia and to the world that the armies of the United States and those of the other members of the United Nations had won a military victory in Korea. For we would not only have defeated the North Korean Communists, but also driven the Chinese Communists back to where we were at the time they initially attacked. This would cause the Communists to lose a tremendous amount of "face" all over Asia. Their heavy losses of men, running into the hundreds of thousands, would have gone for naught. They would not have driven back the armies of the United States and the United Nations. On the contrary, they, the Chinese, would have been severely punished. This would cause the fence sitters to keep away from the Communists and would lead many within the Communist ranks to desert. In addition to being a military victory for us, it would be a propaganda triumph of the first magnitude. It would be tangible and visible proof that Communist aggression had been punished and that it did not pay.

At the same time, there would be a "buffer" zone between this new line and Manchuria. This would be largely mountainous in character. The Chinese Communists could not therefore pretend that we were threatening their territory. This would de-

prive them of an argument which they might otherwise continue to use in their efforts to stir up the Chinese both to fear and to hate us. Ultimately, of course, as passions cooled, this territory could be assimilated into a united Korea.

It would, however, be highly desirable that from the very start, we should have the power plants on the Korean side of the Yalu River under United Nations control. This would prevent the Communists from using their ability to shut off the power to coerce or blackmail the people and industries of Korea.

Perhaps we should also take account of the argument that our mission was to repel the effort to change territorial control by force, and therefore that we ourselves must not use force to make a corresponding shift of the territorial control to the north of the thirty-eighth parallel.

The establishment of a line at the "neck," 100 miles north of the thirty-eighth parallel which I am proposing, does not, however, require the immediate political allocation to South Korea of the strip of territory in the zone between it and the thirty-eighth. This, too, might be made something of a buffer strip but under the protection of United Nations forces and under temporary United Nations civil supervision. Communist troops should not be allowed in this area. But South Korean troops and our own national forces could even be kept south of the thirty-eighth parallel for a time. But the strategic position would be much stronger for defense against any renewal of aggression at the line I have indicated than at the thirty-eighth parallel. Because of their defiance of United Nations appeals and decisions on the Korean aggression, the Communists can hardly justify a claim that we should now merely restore the condition which existed prior to June 1950 without our imposing any additional safeguards against a renewal of attacks. We cannot turn the clock back to June 24, 1950, in view of all that has happened.

Will the Communists agree to such a proposal? I do not know. But I suggest that it is important to find out and that if they refuse, we should most certainly see if the military situation will not permit us to move forward and to drive the Communists back to the neck of Korea.

Perhaps the military situation will not permit us to do this and our very competent generals in the field may feel that a settlement at the thirty-eighth is the best we can do. If so, I shall acquiesce. I have no desire to play military expert at a distance of 10,000 miles with the lives of several hundred thousand men.

But I do feel it proper to express my quietude at the prospect of using the thirty-eighth parallel as the point of settlement. The policy I have suggested may well cost more in the short run, but I cannot help believing that it will save lives and effort in the long run. In any event, I hope that we and our allies will wake up to the danger of uncritically accepting the thirty-eighth parallel merely because it constitutes the easiest terms upon which an armistice may be arranged and the shooting stopped.

Sincerely,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is the amendment which was under discussion yesterday, on page 3, beginning in line 24.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Butler, Md.	Ives	Monroney
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Capehart	Kem	Pastore
Carlson	Kerr	Robertson
Cordon	Knowland	Russell
Flanders	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Frear	Lehman	Underwood
Hayden	Magnuson	Wherry
Hill	McCarran	Young
Hunt	McFarland	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. AIKEN, Mr. CASE, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LODGE, Mr. LONG, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, and Mr. WILLIAMS answered to their names when called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. WELKER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. McCLELLAN, and Mr. HENNINGS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

After a little further delay, Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. ELLENDER entered the Chamber and answered to their names. Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to say that I have been in the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator should not—

Mr. McKELLAR. I know it is not permissible under the rules for debate to occur while a quorum is being obtained, but I simply wish to say that we have been in the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I say ditto to that.

After a little further delay, Mr. NIXON, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BRICKER, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

After a little further delay, Mr. BEN-
TON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ECTON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. WATKINS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connect-

icut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on yesterday the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] addressing himself to the Senate committee amendment to the Interior Department appropriation bill, beginning in line 24, on page 3, and going down to line 22 on page 4, made some observations which I do not believe were pertinent and some statements which, Mr. President, I believe to be in error. Some of the statements made by the distinguished Senator from Nevada were correct, but in my opinion their application is influential in defeating the amendment, rather than in sustaining it.

The Senator from Nevada told us that it was his purpose to put the Southwestern Power Administration on the same basis as the Southeastern Power Administration now is and as the Bonneville Administration now is.

I think the statement with reference to putting the Southwestern Power Administration on the same basis as the Southeastern Power Administration is accurate. I would hope that the statement with reference to putting the Southwestern Power Administration on the same basis as the Bonneville Administration is accurate, but I am convinced that is impossible. I believe those who favor this amendment want to put the Southwestern Power Administration just where the Southeastern Power Administration now is, namely, on a basis where it does not have a single foot of transmission line, where it does not have a single kilowatt of power either to buy or to sell. That is the status of the Southeastern Power Administration, shorn of any responsibility, denied by circumstances and otherwise the op-

portunity of being an instrumentality of the slightest service to the rural electric cooperatives in that area, or of value to the Government. I think the proponents of this amendment would like to see the Southwestern Power Administration in quite as poverty-stricken a condition, both with reference to opportunity to be of service to the rural electric cooperatives or of value to the Government.

I submit that it would be impossible to put Southwestern Power Administration on the same basis as the Bonneville Administration. As my colleague [Mr. MONRONEY] pointed out last evening, the generation of hydroelectric power in the Southwest and from projects operated in connection with the Southwestern Power Administration is on such a limited basis that it is impossible to derive from the available projects sufficient electric energy to have a firm flow of power in excess of 18 percent of the time for the market which it seeks to serve, while on the other hand the steady flow of water in the Columbia River makes the hydroelectric power there almost as firm as it would be if it were generated by steam facilities.

The distinguished Senator from Nevada sought to make it plain, as he said, that he was not against the REA program; yet I must remind him that the continuing-fund provision in the statute is in accordance with the REA program. I remind him that it is the REA program. I remind him that the REA cooperatives were the proponents of it. He remembers well the time in 1949 when that amendment was placed in the law. He remembers that the directors of local REA cooperatives from the Southwest came to Washington by scores and by hundreds. He remembers that they petitioned their representatives in the Congress and the committees to provide the continuing-fund feature in order that, from their viewpoint, the program might become workable. We are all aware that the opposition at that time came from the private utilities in the Southwest; and, so far as I know, the only opposition in the Southwest to the program as it is now provided by the law comes from a few of the private utilities, but not all, because, as I said yesterday, the two in Oklahoma are signatory to the contract which was executed by reason of the existence of the continuing-fund provision of the law.

The distinguished Senator from Nevada read into the RECORD yesterday a statement by a Mr. Gesell, of the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., which appears at page 7976 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9. Mr. Gessell's statement appears on page 1609 of the Senate committee hearings. He said:

So far as the Oklahoma contract is concerned, it is not essential that the continuing fund exist at all.

I call the attention of the Senate to two facts: First, that Mr. Gesell's company is signatory to the contract which was made by reason of the existence of this provision of the law; second, that that contract was negotiated by Mr. Lane, president of the other great public service corporation in Oklahoma, who

has repeatedly recognized and stated that, insofar as the Southwestern Power Administration is concerned, so far as the REA co-ops are concerned, so far as the municipalities seeking power are concerned, and so far as the Government is concerned, the continuing-fund provision is necessary.

I acknowledge that that continuing-fund provision is not necessary for the welfare of the private utilities. I acknowledge that their welfare is not enhanced by the continuing-fund provision. I acknowledge that their profits are not increased by it. Before that provision was written into the law, and before the contract was entered into, which was made possible by the provision, the Oklahoma utilities were buying hydroelectric power at the bus bar. They were paying about 5 mills for half of it, and about 1½ mills for the remainder of it. Since this contract has been entered into, they pay 6¾ mills per kilowatt hour for the power they buy. Therefore, I acknowledge again that the continuing-fund provision is not necessary for the profit or the position or the welfare of the private utilities.

But let us see, Mr. President, who has profited by reason of the existence of the law. In the first place, the rural electric cooperatives have benefited. They have received an abundant quantity of power, instead of the limited and inadequate quantity they had been receiving. They receive it at a much lower cost than they had been paying. Therefore, the rural electric cooperatives profit by reason of the continuing fund provision in the law and the contract which was made as a result of it. Municipalities in Oklahoma profit. I referred yesterday to the specific case of the small community of Wetumka, which now has an abundant supply of power at a reasonable rate, because of the working of the contract, which was made possible and put into operation following the enactment of the continuing-fund provision.

The Government profits by reason of it. The Government can now sell every kilowatt of power it can generate at any of the hydroelectric projects now in existence in the Southwest, or which may be built, at a price which will bring the Government approximately 6¾ mills per kilowatt-hour, instead of having to continue to sell it at an average of less than 3 mills per kilowatt-hour.

Mr. President, who would lose if this committee amendment were adopted? The first group, which would take a terrific loss, would be the rural electric cooperatives. They would have less power, and they would have to pay more money for it. The same is true of any municipality in Oklahoma which now has or may hope to have a source of power. The third entity which would lose, if this amendment were adopted, would be the United States Government. It would again be faced with the condition of having to sell about half its power as dump power, and the rest of it, at a lower price than they now receive for all of it. Who would profit, if this amendment were adopted? There is only one group which

would profit, if the Senate of the United States were to accept this amendment, and that group is the private utilities in the Southwest, two of whom have already acknowledged the equity of the arrangement worked out by reason of the passage of this provision in the law, which it is now sought to repeal.

Without fear of the slightest substantial contradiction, Mr. President, I make the statement that the only ones who can profit from the adoption of the amendment are the private utilities in the Southwest. I make the statement, without the slightest fear of substantial contradiction, that insofar as our part of the country is concerned, the only opposition to the law as it now reads, and the only support for the amendment as offered, comes from a limited number of utilities in the Southwest. I cannot believe that the United States Senate or the Congress, when fully aware of the uncontested facts, that the REA cooperatives, the municipalities, and the Government must lose by the adoption of the amendment, and that only the utilities can profit by it, will seriously, under those circumstances, consider the adoption of an amendment which could have that result, and only that result.

My distinguished friend from Nevada said:

Very simply stated, the continuing fund of the Southwestern Power Administration has become an issue because the fund, since its use was expanded in the Interior Department appropriation of 1950, has been used as a device through which the Southwestern Power Administration is acquiring facilities.

I submit, Mr. President, that that statement is in error. I submit that the Southwestern Power Administration is neither acquiring facilities by reason of the continuing-fund provision in the law, nor is it able to acquire facilities because of the continuing-fund provision.

Let me tell the Senate what the continuing-fund provision permits. The use of the continuing fund is specifically limited to these three uses: No. 1, to defray emergency expenditures necessary to insure continuity of electric service and continuous operation of facilities. The amendment which Senators seek to have adopted would not permit that.

No. 2, to cover all costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy.

No. 3, to cover all costs in connection with the leasing of facilities, not the acquiring of facilities.

I should like to tell the Senate the only sin the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration has committed, if he has committed any sin. He has entered into certain contracts with rural electric cooperatives whereby he leases their high-voltage transmission lines running from their steam generating plants and over which the power from those plants travels to its ultimate destination.

As a part of that lease provision, Mr. President, the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration has acquired an option to purchase those transmission lines. But there are certain conditions with reference to that option which should be stated. In the

first place, the option has been acquired without cost to the Government. In the second place, the option is in favor of or to the benefit of the Government. In other words, after a period of years, I believe 40 years, during which time the rentals paid by the Southwestern Power Administration to the rural electric cooperative have been sufficient to enable the cooperative to pay back to the Rural Electric Administration in Washington all the money borrowed and all the interest required, so that the loan secured from the Government has been fully paid back, at that point the Southwestern Power Administration has an option to acquire the transmission line.

Certain facts, however, stand out in bold relief with reference to that option. In the first place, the Administrator must come to Congress to get an appropriation for even the \$10, if that is the option price, to acquire the transmission line.

In the second place, the low figure at which he has the option to purchase that transmission line, if Congress by making an appropriation authorizes him to do so, is the result of the fact that he has paid the rural electric cooperatives through the years for the lease of the line a sufficient amount to enable them to pay back to the Government every dollar they borrowed with which they built the line, and the interest on the money, or the unpaid portion of it while it is being repaid to the Government.

It may be that the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration has been too thrifty an agent of the Federal Government to please certain Senators. If the Senate of the United States or the Congress wants to say to him, "You have made too good a deal for the Government; we want you to make a deal of less value to your Government," I say to the Senate that he will comply with that mandate. Apparently, insofar as the Senate is concerned, his efficient service for the Government has been taken as the basis for criticism, and certain Senators now want to cripple his activities because he has done too good a job for the Government. If we want him to be less efficient, and will tell him so, he will comply.

I should think, Mr. President, that instead of seeking to interfere with his work, he should be commended by the Congress for the effectiveness, the efficiency, and the thrift of his operation, rather than to be condemned for it. He has not taken advantage of the rural electric cooperatives. His contract with them makes it possible for them to be in such a condition that they are a good enough risk to enable the REA to make a loan to a cooperative whereby it can build the generating facility. Without the contract with the Administrator, Mr. President, there would be the same situation in Oklahoma which exists in Minnesota, as it was portrayed yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The rural co-ops in Minnesota have borrowed money and built generating plants. Three of them operate on such a basis that they cannot produce sufficient power to meet the demands made

on them. Three of them have a surplus of power, and have to slow down in their operation, which decreases the usefulness of their facility and increases the cost of their product. If they had a line connecting them, and a grid whereby all their power could flow into the same system, the overproduction of the one could be used to supply the demands of the other.

That problem has been eliminated in Oklahoma, Mr. President, by reason of the contract which has been made possible. The Western Electric Co-op began, in 1940, to get the money with which to build their generating plant. Their plans were made and approved. Their application for a loan had been received, accepted, and approved, but the requirements of the World War II for critical materials were such that they were compelled to postpone the building of their plant. So it was deferred for the duration of World War II. Immediately thereafter, the Western Electric Cooperative renewed their effort to secure the loan from the REA with which to build their steam-generating plant to supply an area which was poverty-stricken for power.

When they initiated their application in 1941, the utilities opposed their request for loans, saying, "There is no need for power in that area." Yet today the utilities themselves are building there, or planning to build, a steam-generating plant which will produce either three or four times as much as the plant which the rural electric cooperatives are building; and those who look into the future and judge on the basis of reality know that both plants will not be able to supply the demand in western Oklahoma. So, after the war, the cooperative renewed their application for a loan with which to build the plant. But the cost had gone up; indeed, it had gone up so much that they could not justify the loan on the basis of the output which they would be able to produce and the price they would be able to obtain for it.

Then came the opportunity to make the contract with Southwestern Power, whereby they could sell every kilowatt they could produce operating 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. Then the loan to them became feasible. Then the foundation was laid upon which it was justifiable to make the loan.

So the REA's are profiting by this contract. They seek it. They favor it. They were happy to give the Southwestern Power Administration's Administrator the option after 40 years to acquire the transmission facilities they leased to him on a basis whereby they would be paid enough in rental to repay with interest every dollar of the loan they had made.

So the Administrator thought he was doing a good thing for his Government when he took an option whereby, after the lease money he had been paying was sufficient to retire every loan, with interest, he could acquire the facility for the account of the United States Government for a very modest price. But, as I said a while ago, he could not implement that option, Mr. President, until and unless the Congress authorized it and appropriated the money for it.

So I return, Mr. President, to the statement that the distinguished Senator from Nevada was in error when he said that the continuing fund has become an issue because its use was expanded and it became a device through which the Southwestern Power Administration is acquiring facilities.

I say again to the Senate that if we want to condemn the Administrator for having made so favorable a contract, not for himself, not for the REA, not for the utilities, but for his Government, his principal, then tell him not to continue to make such good contracts any more, and he will not do it. I do not believe Senators, knowing the facts, will condemn an agent of the Government for being frugal and thrifty at the same time he is being efficient and effective in carrying forward his program.

Mr. President, it would be a tragedy for this amendment to be adopted. It would be a tragedy that would result in a loss to Oklahoma REA's and those in the Southwest generally. It would be a loss to the Government if the amendment were to be adopted. It would be a source of profit only to the private utilities, two of whom in Oklahoma have already signed a contract whereby they put themselves in a position of saying, "We do not want the additional profit which this amendment would give us."

I do not believe the great Senate of the United States will adopt an amendment which would penalize the rural electric cooperatives, which would penalize municipalities now securing this power, or those that could secure it, which would penalize any Government facility that receives it, which would penalize the Government itself in the sale of its power, and which would result in an unasked and unearned profit to the utilities in the Southwest who are neither in position to ask for it nor worthy to receive it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it is my intention to make a point of order against the language beginning on page 3, line 24, and lines 1 to 22, inclusive, on page 4, as legislation on an appropriation bill. But I know that that will close the debate, and I should like to inquire whether there are Senators who desire to be heard before making the point of order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] desires to be heard.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then I withhold the point of order for the moment.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 51. An act for the relief of Arthur Henrik Sorensen, Maren Anderson Sorensen, and minor child, Evelyn Sorensen;

S. 124. An act for the relief of Mrs. George (Wong Tze-yen) Poy;

S. 275. An act for the relief of Rafael Kubelik, his wife, Ludmila Kubelik, and their minor son, Martin Kubelik;

S. 417. An act for the relief of Sui Ken Fong and Sui Tung Fong;

S. 536. An act for the relief of the estate of Sidney Lomax, deceased;

S. 631. An act for the relief of Conrad Xavier Charles Maurer;

S. 699. An act for the relief of James M. Shellenberger, Jr., a minor;

S. 879. An act for the relief of Luigi Podesta;

S. 915. An act for the relief of Betty Minoru Kawachi;

S. 1109. An act for the relief of Grady Franklin Welch;

S. 1113. An act for the relief of Philip J. Hincks; and

S. 1438. An act for the relief of Paul D. Banning, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 953) for the relief of Joseph A. Myers, Hazel C. Myers, and Helen Myers.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, before discussing the amendment, I want to read two telegrams into the RECORD. The first is from Umatilla, Ore.—quite a way from the Southwestern Power Administration—and the second is from Heppner, Ore. The first is as follows:

Request your support of original Interior appropriation bill without any amendments. Any other action will be vote against rural electrification. It has demonstrated its worth many times as an investment and no expense to the Government. Please advise us of action you take when this bill comes before the Senate.

The telegram is signed "W. C. Kik, president, Umatilla Electric Cooperative Association."

The second, from Heppner, Ore., reads as follows:

Regards the Interior amendments which you will soon be asked to vote on. Please support these amendments as it is vital to our existence in obtaining low-cost power. Also please note that in these, you will be voting for or against the rural electrification program. Your support is urgently needed.

Signed "Columbia Basin Electric Cooperative, Inc., Kenneth Smouse, president."

Mr. President, I undertake to say that neither Mr. Kik nor Mr. Smouse had an opportunity to study this bill or its provisions, or any amendments proposed by the committee, or amendments which might be intended to be proposed by Members of the Senate when the bill reached the floor. These are worthy gentlemen. They are very much interested in the rural electrification movement, and properly so. But these two telegrams were sent by them at somebody else's request. I do not believe it would take a Hawkshaw to identify the source of the request, and I suggest that the name might be Clyde Ellis.

In other words, again we are faced with pressure tactics. They are very effective at times. Perhaps they may be this time. Note these statements. It is said that we are voting for or against rural electrification. Nothing in God's wide world is further from the truth. We who have supported appropriations and have worked in subcommittees to attain such appropriations, and who have endeavored to see that the funds were

soundly and wisely expended to effectuate rural electrification, find ourselves faced with that kind of ill-advised statement. It is not the judgment of the gentlemen who send the telegrams, but the judgment of someone else.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wish to testify, as a member of the Appropriations Committee who has served on that committee for a number of years, that the senior Senator from Oregon has consistently been a constructive advocate of rural electrification. He has been mindful of the importance of rural electrification to the Nation as well as to his own State of Oregon; and I know of no Senator on either side of the aisle who has taken greater interest in the constructive development of rural electrification than has the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I very greatly appreciate the statement of the Senator from California. It is seldom that the bouquets arrive while on is still alive.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I received a similar telegram from a local rural electric cooperative. However, I also received another telegram, from a local power company, urging me to take exactly the opposite position. I have strong suspicions that that telegram was also sent by request. So I am wondering if we should not recognize the fact that perhaps there are two pressure groups involved.

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to have had that statement from the Senator from Vermont. He beat me to the punch. I wanted to take up that point as the next step.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sorry if I beat the Senator to the punch.

Mr. CORDON. I am glad the Senator did. I like corroboration before the statement is made.

I have also received the same type of telegram from private utilities which have no interest in that area. Unquestionably the telegrams come from a similar source.

In my opinion, it is the duty of a Member of the United States Senate not to wholly disregard that sort of thing, but to inquire into the soundness of any representations which are made, to attempt to understand any reasoning which may be submitted, and then to use such judgment as God gave him, and that alone, in making his decision. Less than that is less than the duty which a citizen owes his country. Enough with reference to pressure tactics.

With respect to the question of relevancy, I know that a point of order will presently be made, and that once it is made there will be opportunity for debate.

Very frankly, I think there is a grave question involved in the point of order which will be made with respect to the germaneness of this amendment at the place where it appears, and in connection

with the particular provision to which it is attached as a proviso.

Mr. President, I know of no tougher question to come to a man who seeks to be wholly fair with himself, and in accordance with the established rules and precedents of the Senate, than a decision of this character. I say very frankly that I favor the amendment, and I hope presently to indicate why I favor it. On the other hand, the question, important as it is, is not of sufficient importance to justify the Senate in overturning precedents with reference to the question of germaneness when that question reaches the floor of the Senate.

I am of the opinion, after such consideration as I have been able to give to the question, that there is one basis upon which this proviso can be deemed to be a germane amendment. The inclusion by the House of the provision for a continuing emergency fund for the Southeastern Power Administration is in itself notice that that body has adopted, with reference to the administration of the power policies of the United States, a different concept than that which is included in the so-called continuing fund section of the substantive law. That provision came into the substantive law in the same way that this amendment appears in the pending bill, that is, by way of an amendment to an appropriation bill. Both again emphasize the vice of trying to write substantive legislation in an appropriation bill on the floor of the Senate. If we may assume that the House, in writing into this bill the provision with respect to the Southeastern Power Administration, was enunciating the policy of limiting the use of receipts from the sales of federally-produced power to meet emergency needs, repairs, and so forth, to maintain continuity of service—if we may take the position that that is the view of the House, then we have the right to take the position that the House, had it had the opportunity to consider this question with relation to the Southwestern Power Administration, would have taken the same view. However, we are now in the process of determining policy in a place where it should not be determined, namely, in an appropriation bill. Let that be understood.

I believe we can properly say that if we are to pass judgment on the question of the application of Federal money in one section of the United States by amendment, we have the right, as a relevant and germane modification of that statement of policy, to make an application of Federal funds under the same circumstances elsewhere within the United States.

In my opinion, on that basis it is possible properly and legally, and in accordance with the precedents, to determine that the proposed proviso is germane. I myself know of no other basis. For that reason, Mr. President, I wish to support the inclusion of the amendment as a germane proviso.

In presenting my argument I hope I can be entirely frank. I wish to be wholly unbiased. In order that I may

present my views on that basis, let me say, first, that I am one Member of the United States Senate who is committed to the proposition that wherever it is possible in the United States we should have private ownership and private incentive and private initiative and private interest. I make that statement at this time because I do not want to be misunderstood, either on the floor of the Senate or in my State.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. For a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; for a question with respect to the last statement made by the Senator. I was wondering how the Senator feels about the public ownership of most of the power resources in the hydroelectric field in his section of the country, and whether he intends to make an effort to return them to private ownership. As I understand, most of the hydroelectric power in the Senator's area is Government owned.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not quite understand the Senator's position. As I understood, he has always promoted that program in his area of the country.

Mr. CORDON. I have always promoted the use of electric energy. The Senator is correct. Sometimes, because there was a dollar or two more appropriated for that purpose, the Senator from Oregon has been accused of promoting it in the West to the detriment of some other part of the United States. Of course, there was no basis for such accusation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator from Oregon see any inconsistency in the statement which he has just made with respect to private ownership and the program which he has so successfully promoted in his State?

Mr. CORDON. I see no inconsistency whatever. I shall now return to my first statement.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Several of us are not clear whether the Senator referred to the committee amendment or to the Kerr amendment when he stated that he would support the amendment.

Mr. CORDON. I was referring to the committee amendment. Of necessity, in supporting the committee amendment I must vote upon the question of germaneness when that question arises. Therefore I wish first to discuss that question. I want the RECORD to show that on the question of germaneness I shall vote that the amendment is germane, in order that the amendment may remain in the bill and come before us for a vote. When I say "in order," I wish it to be understood that I have first satisfied myself on the question of germaneness.

I now wish to go back to my first statement, namely, that I am one of those Senators who believe in private enterprise. I believe that when my statement is read by the Senator from

Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], he will notice a slight qualification. However, in case he should overlook it, I shall phrase it in different words.

I am in favor of private enterprise. Of course, every thinking man recognizes that there are conditions under which the Government, as such, must function, although under different circumstances private enterprise may function. That statement is not an exception to my views. It is only an extension of my views. I recognize, as everyone must recognize who believes in representative government and in the basic concept that governments are established for the benefit of the governed, that all power rests in the people. I believe in the right of any group of people, however small or however large, among the one-hundred-and-fifty-odd million people who make up the United States, to decide whether they shall have in any particular field, or in any portion of any particular field, private ownership or public ownership. It is a right which rests in the people themselves.

Knowing what the views of a considerable number of people in a given area are, I should be less than honest if I were to deny them the knowledge of my own views. They have a right to know my views. They have a right also to know that when they have decided, in accordance with the processes prescribed by the law, whether they want private or public ownership, I, as their servant, am bound by their views. That is my idea of serving the people who have sent me to the Senate.

Because I take the position I have set forth, I do not wish to stand here as a false champion for either private or public ownership. I want my views in the RECORD.

I am sorry the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] has left the Chamber. He will be able to read the compliment I am about to pay to him. It is a very sincere compliment from the Senator from Oregon to the senior Senator from Oklahoma. I particularly refer to the senior Senator from Oklahoma, rather than including both Senators from Oklahoma, because the senior Senator from Oklahoma today on the floor of the Senate presented the most complete picture of the situation in the Oklahoma area that has ever been presented on the floor of the Senate or before any committee on which I have served. I wish to compliment him on presenting fully to the Senate the situation existing in Oklahoma, the circumstances which gave rise to the situation, and, from his viewpoint, the necessity for maintaining the continuing fund, although in that respect I differ with him.

I am making this statement so that Members of the Senate, if they will read the RECORD, may be fully advised. I suspect that many Members of the Senate will not read the RECORD, and I can understand why that is so. There are too many subjects occupying the attention of Senators at this time for any Senator to cover all the subjects which are presented, either in committee or on the floor of the Senate. Unfortunately

we have in the Congress of the United States rather adopted a procedure in legislation of attempting to cover the waterfront, so to speak, at every session. We seem to have the idea that volume is synonymous with quality in legislation, although, unfortunately, that is far from the truth. However, Mr. President, the record is there for those who care to read it.

I cannot agree with the views of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] either as to the law involved or as to the facts as stated, insofar as those facts were embroidered with the Senator's views as to how they might or might not be changed by reason of this committee amendment, if it is adopted.

Now getting to the meat of the matter, Mr. President, let us examine a thumbnail picture of the obligations of the Federal Government in this field. Public power has now come to mean generally power generated by the Federal Government in excess of its needs. Such power first came into being in a general way as a result of the passage of the 1944 Flood Control Act, which was an omnibus rivers-and-harbors and flood-control authorization act. In it appeared for the first time ambitious projects for both improvement of navigation and flood control, wherein multiple purpose was found in the recommendations, in so far as the construction of dams was concerned. Until that time, dams were built to retain water for the purpose either of aiding navigation or of retarding floods; but with the 1944 act, multiplicity of purpose was written into the law, so that a dam might at one and the same time serve at least three purposes: First, to control flood waters; second, to improve navigation; and, third, to generate power. In many instances there was a fourth purpose, namely, reclamation in the arid areas.

When that bill was under consideration before the then Senate Commerce Committee, for the first time consideration was given to what was to be done by the Government with the power generated at the dams constructed by the Army engineers throughout the country.

There had been exceptions before that time. The Army engineers already had built the Bonneville Dam between the States of Oregon and Washington, and there had been other exceptions; but that was the first time Congress enacted general law on the subject.

In that Flood Control Act, as shown by the hearings, after several rewritings of sundry provisions with respect to the handling of power, the final provision was in substance that the power should be delivered at the bus bar by the Corps of Engineers to the Secretary of the Interior, who became the sales agent, and was directed to sell the power to certain selected customers first, at the lowest rates consistent with good business management; and the Secretary was authorized to construct transmission lines, if necessary, for that purpose. Mr. President, that was, in substance, all the law on the statute books at the time when Mr. Douglas Wright became Administrator of the Southeastern Power Administration.

There have been various interpretations of the meaning of that short provision of the Flood Control Act. I shall not go into that matter. I disagree with many of the interpretations; but so far as this particular matter is affected, when the Southwestern Power Administration became the servicing agent for all of the Corps of Engineers dams in the southwestern area of the United States, a number of problems arose. Included among them was the necessity of connecting the dams, the question of transmitting the energy, and then the all-important question, which every Member of Congress could have known about, had he read and understood the reports which the Corps of Engineers had made on every dam in the multiple-purpose field in that area they had ever recommended to the Congress in all their history. In every instance they estimated the amount of energy which might be generated at the several dams, and they identified the energy as being of the peaking or variable type which was not satisfactory as a continuous supply of electric current for a continuous demand, or firm energy, for sale generally. That appears in every report; and in every report, when they estimated the amount of energy, they determined its value as peaking power. That was known long before Mr. Wright became Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration as such.

Mr. President, after the Southwestern Power Administration was established, Mr. Wright became the Administrator. He is a competent engineer; he is, from his lights, a faithful and honest servant of the United States. He seeks to do what, in his opinion, is the best thing for the people in the area he serves. He is entitled to have that said of him by me at least on the floor of the Senate. However, when Mr. Wright looked over the series of dams which were coming under his jurisdiction, being a good engineer, and particularly a good electrical engineer, and, I believe, having a passionate belief in public ownership of power—although that is only my belief; he has never said that to me—the thing which first came into the mind of Douglas Wright was that inasmuch as this power was peaking power, the thing for the Government to do would be to build the necessary steam plants in order to get a continuous base for electrical power, and then superimpose the variable power from the dams, and thus obtain not only the greatest value from the peaking power, but also an electrical public-ownership empire, as a result of the establishment of the base of steam-generated power. That plan was presented to the Congress, but the Congress denied the funds with which to do that job. That is one of the most important points before the Senate at this time, namely, that the Congress acted upon the application, and denied it.

Mr. Wright's actions thereafter do not meet with my approval. I believe that the administrator of any law is the executor of a trust. I believe that if any man working for the Government in an executive or administrative position or field desires to change the law, he has the perfect right, and it is his duty, to

resign his job and get elected to Congress, and come to Congress, and there seek to change the law in the way the Constitution provides that changes in the law shall be made.

However, Mr. Wright did not do that. Having been directly denied the funds with which to build steam plants and the funds with which to build transmission lines, Mr. Wright, when he was denied that right, turned to a new field. He is ingenious, and he seeks to carry out his convictions. I differ with him only with respect to whether he had the right to act as he did. The Rural Electrification Act was on the statute books. That act made available the credit of the United States to rural cooperatives anywhere in the United States, to assist them in securing something which they all sorely needed, electrical power; something which the private companies could have furnished but did not furnish. I hold no brief for them in their lack of vision and in their failure to discharge what, in my opinion, was their clear duty as a quasi-public organization.

Mr. Wright turned to the Rural Electrification Act. That act provides authority for its Administrator to loan money to rural cooperatives for the purpose of building transmission lines, and so forth, or, in those cases where they cannot secure power at reasonable rates and on an adequate basis, to construct generation facilities. It is a separate act from the Flood Control Act; there is no connection between them.

The Flood Control Act basically is administered by the Corps of Engineers; the power which results from it is administered by the Secretary of the Interior; and the REA is under the Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. Wright was employed by the Interior Department only. He performed his duties well, in my opinion. Of course, he never told me that, but what was accomplished was too well done not to have been performed by a good mind; and he has a good mind. It was perfectly clear that what the Government had denied directly, namely, the money to build steam plants, with about 18,000 miles of transmission lines, and to establish in this field Government ownership in the southwest portion of the United States, might be achieved by indirection; and it was.

How was it achieved? Let us not forget that the only authority of law possessed by Mr. Wright consisted of a few words in the Flood Control Act of 1944. Nevertheless, he worked up with rural electric cooperatives some agreements, by which they would construct the steam plants which the Congress denied him the right to construct, and by which they would construct the net of transmission lines which the Congress had prohibited him from constructing.

But the electric cooperatives had to make a showing, under the law, of feasibility, in order to get that kind of money; because it went into the tens of millions of dollars in the affected areas. Mr. Wright was equal to that necessity. His contract provides that he will, in the case of a steam plant, buy the total output of the steam plant from the cooperative. If the cooperative will con-

struct the transmission lines, then he will lease the transmission lines and that is not a wheeling agreement, by the way. He will lease the transmission lines, and he will guarantee payment for the use of the transmission lines necessary to repay the Federal Government, in the REA division, the total capital outlay, plus interest.

Mr. Wright becomes a guarantor of REA investment; but I do not find any authority for that in the law. Mr. Wright in every instance, wrote into the contract he entered into a provision that that the payments were intended to amortize the loan; and, Mr. President, the senior Senator from Oklahoma mentioned that Mr. Wright, being very zealous of the interests of his Government provided that, once these heavy investments were in effect amortized, the Government would have an option to purchase the plant and lines. According to my understanding, that is true. The senior Senator from Oklahoma said the purchase would be at a very nominal price; so nominal, my understanding is, that it was \$1 or \$10 in each instance, although the facilities might be worth hundreds of thousands or even millions of dollars.

I have no objection to that kind of zeal for the Government, although I should prefer, after facilities were amortized, to leave them still in the ownership of the local people, who themselves were the ones in need, and who would still need the facilities. If there is not to be private ownership, then I want public ownership right down at the grass roots where the people live. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, I would rather, after the loan on the facilities was amortized, if it should be, that they still remain the property of the people whose vision and courage went into their construction in the first place.

I wish to concentrate on one thing, namely, the legal aspects of the problem. In my opinion there was and is no authority justifying Mr. Wright in doing what he sought to do. I am not questioning whether there should be authority. Perhaps what is contemplated is sound, where a majority of people desire this sort of service. If so, let it be done in the proper way. Let it be done by means of a bill which is carefully thought out, which comes before this body and which is explained to the Senate, so that Senators may know what they are doing, and let us not put Doug Wright, seeking in good faith to advance the interests of the people in the area where he serves, in the position of trying to do by indirection what he knew, from the word of the Congress, he had no legal authority to do directly. It is not fair to him.

Where does that bring us with reference to this particular amendment, Mr. President? I think it should be perfectly clear to anyone that when we charge a man with the heavy responsibilities which rest on the shoulders of Douglas Wright, and then circumscribe him with the shackles of the appropriative procedures of the Congress, we almost require him to do a thing which we attempt to prohibit him from doing. He is almost in that paradoxical situation.

He is in business, an important business, and the Government is not established to handle that kind of business. Under those circumstances, there are certain naked necessities for variation from the ordinary appropriative procedures and for the ordinary administration of funds which must be adopted if Mr. Wright is to have any chance at all to do his job. One of them is the necessity for meeting emergencies that could not be foreseen when appropriations were made.

The Senator from Oregon was a member of the Appropriations Committee and favored the exception which was granted at the time when Congress, I think in 1949, recognizing this necessity, provided a fund of \$100,000 which should be continuously available to the Administrator of SPA for the purpose of meeting emergency necessities, in order that there might be no break in the continuity of service to be rendered with respect to the delivery of Federal power.

If my memory now serves me correctly, the next request was for \$300,000. I believe that was only last year. The senior Senator from Oklahoma prepared an amendment, offered it on the Senate floor, and it was adopted. But, Mr. President, when the \$300,000 came into the picture, it was no longer an emergency fund. It was properly denominated a continuing fund, but where it did not fully disclose its purpose was the point at which it was described as a \$300,000 continuing fund.

Mr. President, when we read that particular provision we must reach the conclusion that Congress intended to establish a fund of \$300,000, and that that was the limit of the amount of money which might be spent within any fiscal year. Let me read the provision:

Continuing fund, power transmission facilities: All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy under the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 * * * generated or purchased in the Southwestern Power area, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts—

That is general language. Let us follow this language—

except that the Treasury shall set up and maintain from such receipts a continuing fund of \$300,000, including the sum of \$100,000 in the continuing fund established under the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944 * * * which shall be transferred to the fund hereby established; and said fund of \$300,000 shall be placed to the credit of the Secretary and shall be subject to check by him to defray emergency expenses necessary to insure continuity of electric service and continuous operation of the facilities, and to cover all costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy and rentals for the use of facilities for the transmission and distribution of electric power and energy to public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies.

I undertake to say, Mr. President, that anyone reading that language would reach the conclusion that it provided a fund of \$300,000 for the purposes set forth. As matter of law—and I know that any lawyer worthy of the name will have to agree with the statement—

there is no limit upon the amount which can be spent in any period of time under the terms of the amendment except the limit imposed by taking the total amount of funds which have heretofore been and are now being placed in the Treasury of the United States as gross receipts from the whole operation of the Southwestern Power Administration. There is no limit beyond that, and the \$300,000 is, in legal effect, only a prohibition on the Secretary of the Interior against the writing of a single check in excess of \$300,000. That is what it means in law. That is why I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada should be adopted. Under the language of the amendment there is available to Douglas Wright, as the agent of the Secretary of the Interior, every dollar that has ever been paid into the Treasury of the United States from the Southwestern Power Administration and every dollar that will be paid while this section remains on the statute books.

There is a limit as to what the money may be used for, and that is reasonably clear. It is to "defray emergency expenditures necessary to insure continuity of electric service and the continuous operation of facilities." That is altogether sound. It is to "cover all costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy."

The Flood Control Act of 1944 does not contain expressly or by implication any authority to anyone to purchase any electric power or energy.

There is also reference to "rentals for the use of facilities for the transmission and distribution of electric power and energy to public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies." Those words are window dressing.

Mr. President, we are now at the meat of the proposition. This continuing fund is a blank check in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior for every dollar of receipts that will come to the Southwestern Power Administration from whatever source. Let us see how that affects the fiscal situation of the United States.

It is not a problem of Oklahoma, Mr. President; it is not a problem of southern Missouri; it is not a problem of the Southwest area. It goes to the very heart of the integrity of the Treasury of the United States. It goes to the very heart of the integrity of the Flood-Control Act. Let us remember that when funds go into the Treasury of the United States they, of necessity, go for one of two purposes: They go into the unappropriated funds of the Treasury and become the property of all the people, subject to appropriation, subject to being applied in the general fund of the Treasury, to all bonds and other indebtedness of the United States, or they go into some special, earmarked fund, and as such they are subject to use only for the specific statutory purposes enumerated, and they are not a part of the assets of the United States. They cannot be used to pay the debts of the United States.

I submit, Mr. President, that not one dollar ever paid by the Southwestern Power Administration into the Treasury

of the United States can go free into the funds of the United States so long as this language is on the statute books. Every dollar that goes into the Treasury of the United States while this language is in the law as it is today is entitled by that provision, which, apparently, would limit the Secretary to \$300,000, when there is no limitation on the Secretary beyond the limitation that he cannot spend more than \$300,000 by any given check.

Mr. President, there is a series of dams in the Southwest area. Those dams were constructed with the money of the people of the United States. A part of the capital investment is charged off against general benefits of flood control and navigation, and is not repayable. The part that is allocated to investment in power is repayable. There is a charge set up in the Treasury with respect to each of those capital investments, and the reimbursable portion is to be met by the unentailed receipts from the power generated at a particular dam, and until that money can come into the Treasury and be offset against that capital investment, the total of the capital investment must remain on the books, with its accruing interest, endlessly.

The only way to stop the interest, the only way to retire the capital investment, the only way the people of the United States can ever know whether they were wise or foolish in making the investment, or that their servants, the Corps of Engineers, did or did not use good judgment when they made their prognosis with reference to future payments and future justifications, is by setting up the receipts from the actual sale of the energy as a credit to offset the capital investment and the continually increasing interest. That cannot be done—and I am as certain of my facts and my law as I am that I am standing on my feet today—so long as there is in existence a contingent or a conditional power which can be called into play—not may be, not will be, but can be. So long as there is a conditional power to draw those funds from the Treasury they cannot become unappropriated funds in the General Treasury subject to offsetting against the capital investment.

This presents the reason why I think we ought to amend the bill. In amending it I do not want to hurt the people of Oklahoma, or the people of Missouri, or people anywhere else. But, Mr. President, I do believe it was unwise in the first place to put the provision in the law. There should have been some limitation so that some part of the funds could have been forever discharged from any contingent liability, so that they could ultimately be used for the purpose for which they were intended to be used, namely, finally to offset the capital investment in the power features of the dams. That cannot be done under the present language of the law.

The Senator from Oklahoma cited the situation he so well knows in his own State of cooperatives having been induced to invest in transmission facilities and in steam-generating plants a very great sum, perhaps millions of dollars; I do not know what the exact amount is. They were induced to do it by reason of

a promise by the Southwestern Power Administration to lease the transmission line on the basis of such payments as in effect are 40-year installments on the purchase, or to purchase the power from steam installations on a basis that represents 50-year purchase installment contracts, which is what they really are. Then, with that guaranty, of course the cooperatives could go to the Administrator of REA and get their loans, because the loans in effect would have been guaranteed.

Mr. President, we do not need the kind of language here employed to make that possible, if that is what we want to do. The statement has been made by the two champions of what is suggested, the Senators from Oklahoma, that the power purchased will be purchased for a sum much less than the sum for which it will be sold; that it cannot be stored, that it must be sold, and as we all know, the two operators are almost instantaneous. The Government purchases the power that comes over the transmission line, and sells it, and most of it the Government sells right back to the individuals from whom it was purchased. So they are operations going on coincidentally every minute of the day and night. If the Government is getting more for what it is selling than it is paying for what it is buying, why does it need a blank check on every dollar of receipts from all the dams in the Southwest? There is only one reason why it would be needed, Mr. President, and that is that a bad mistake might be made. The Government might have made a bad contract. Do not forget that these contracts carry minimum payments, and the minimum payments represent the amount that is necessary to amortize the debt in 40 or 50 years in each instance—not the debts of SPA, not the debts of the Federal Government, but the debts of the cooperatives.

The money is not needed, Mr. President, if this is a sound deal. I am not discussing for the moment whether it is legal. I am merely taking the view which I think the people of Oklahoma in the rural areas who need the electricity would take. They want the electricity. They want the power. God bless them, I want them to have it, and I will help them get it and keep it, but I cannot agree that it be done in this way.

Mr. President, we can provide for a fund in any reasonable amount coming from receipts, and I am perfectly willing to have such a provision accepted and written into the bill, or, better still, presented to the appropriate committees. In that event, I say here and now I shall be glad to go before the committee as a proponent, and support the suggestion there, and support it on the floor of the Senate. I do not, however, like that so well; I would prefer to have an appropriation made, because I do not like a revolving fund. I think it is unsound. I know my friend from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] shares with me that basic view, as almost everyone who is familiar with this kind of Federal financing. But because of the business characteristics of this provision, because

of the fact that some matters cannot be foreseen, I would be willing in an instance of this kind to permit a fund to be set aside from receipts and made available, but it should be a fund to which there would be a limit in dollars. It should be a fund which would leave free and unentailed the balance of the revenues from these dams and transmission lines.

They must be paid for. I do not believe that anyone would think otherwise. I do not believe that there is anyone who does not want to see these investments as sound investments, repaid to the Federal Treasury, so that the program may move on in the way it should move. But we do not need this kind of a provision to do it. We can adopt a provision which does carry a limitation, and we can set a liberal ceiling, so far as that is concerned. If necessary, we can write the standards under which the money is to be spent.

I undertake to say that for a long time to come Mr. Wright would never draw a nickel out of the continuing fund. He never has yet. He did draw out some \$78,000 from the old \$100,000 fund, at various times, for the purpose for which it was furnished, namely, emergency repairs and the like. But up to date he has never used a dollar of the \$300,000 fund. If there continues to be in this country the kind of expanding electrical market which I believe there will be, he never will have to use it. But every time there is made a contract such as those which have been made, the legality of which is now in dispute in the Federal Court in Missouri, I am advised, we underwrite, with the funds of the Southwestern Power Administration and Interior Department operation, limited only to the sale of power at the Federal dams, the capital investment made by the Department of Agriculture through a Rural Electrification Administration. Mr. President, we cannot find authority for that in this language of the bill. We cannot find it in the Flood Control Act of 1944, or any other Flood Control Act, or any other act or section of an act on the statute books of the United States. The authority is not there.

Mr. President, I regret that this question is before the Senate in connection with this bill. But it is here. I would have preferred to go into it before a regular legislative committee and work out the problem when all the factors could be presented.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. Just a moment.

Mr. President, I do not overlook the fact that some of these contracts were signed, sealed, and delivered before the provision in question went on the statute books in 1950. However, I do not want any more of them made until there is statutory authority, and until sound standards are established to govern them. That is the only reason I support the position which I have described.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Does not the Senator know that the language which it is

sought to amend went on the statute books in 1949 and not 1950?

Mr. CORDON. I answer the Senator in this wise: His statement yesterday was that until this amendment went on the statute books, there was no power to do any of the things mentioned.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the language went on the statute books in 1949?

Mr. CORDON. I have answered the Senator. Now I shall continue my statement.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask for order.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, there may be a necessity for a guaranty by the Federal Government of the loans which it itself makes. But I cannot understand that kind of paradox. If the Federal Government loans the money in the first instance and uses its right hand to do it, if the money is in jeopardy after it is loaned, the mere fact that the left hand of the Federal Government makes a guaranty does not make the job done by the right hand any more secure because the left hand may come over and guarantee the right hand.

If this kind of a guaranty is necessary at all, I cannot understand finance. I cannot understand risk, and I cannot understand the principles of guaranty. If it is a sound loan when it is made, it is a sound loan because of the facts which exist in the area and the market which is there or is to be expected; and the market is no bigger because the Government, through Douglas Wright, steps in and writes a guaranty. There is not a thing in those contracts which cannot be written into a true wheeling contract; and the leasing of lines on an installment basis equivalent to a contract of purchase has not the faintest resemblance to a wheeling contract.

I have heard the statement made here—and it has been made to me in some telegrams and letters which I have received—and if this amendment is adopted there can be no more wheeling contracts.

Mr. President, we must understand the difference between operating leased facilities and entering into a wheeling contract. A wheeling contract is a service contract. The facilities which are used are in the possession of the individual or corporation rendering the service. The operation of leased facilities means that the holder of the lease is, for the term of the lease, in possession, operation, and full control of the facilities. One is a leasing operation and the other a wheeling operation, and they are as far apart as the poles.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that what happens in the case of a wheeling contract is this: The Southwestern Power

Authority, taking its directions from section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, sells the power to the cooperative, or municipality, or other preferred customer; but in order to sell it to the preferred customer, the power must be transmitted. It must be carried to the customer. So the Southwestern Power Administration simply leases the right to make use of the service of the transmission lines to deliver the power to the preferred customer.

Mr. CORDON. That is a lease, and not a wheeling agreement. The same operation might be had under a wheeling contract, in accordance with which the owner of the line continues to operate the line, though he may do so solely as an agent. He takes the Government power in one place and delivers it in another, under the direction of the Government. That is a wheeling contract.

Mr. HILL. But the Government, as the owner or generator of power, must have a contract to use the transmission line to carry the power to the preferred customer. The Southwestern Power Administration gets its authority to lease, hire, or buy the right to the use of the line, under the authority now in the law to lease.

Mr. CORDON. I believe we have before us a matter which needs a little exploration. I believe it goes to the philosophy of the whole question of public power. I shall explore it slightly. The Flood Control Act of 1944 directed the delivery to the Secretary of the Interior of power from Army engineer dams, period. It did not authorize the Secretary of the Interior to buy or sell any power other than the power resulting from the power installations at Federal dams.

Wheeling contracts—and I speak now of true wheeling contracts—in my opinion are clearly within the meaning and intent of the Flood Control Act, when it says, in connection with the sale of power, that the sale shall be made in such a manner as to promote the widest distribution, at reasonable rates, and so forth. As I understand, it means that the Secretary is entitled to do any and all things which will change the characteristics of the power from interruptible or variable power to demand or firm power, so long as the final result is that the power he sells is the equivalent of the power which the Flood Control Act gives him to sell. When he leaves that concept and takes the new view, that because he is taking power rather than taking power and changing it to the equivalent of demand power and is selling it, he should build, by direction or indirection, all the necessary base under the peak, so as to have for sale not only the power from the dams, but all the firm power below which is necessary to support the use of the peaking power on top; we have a widening of the purpose and intent of the Flood Control Act to the broad aspects of public Federal power at wholesale—and it is only a step from that to retail—in the whole area where we have peaking power. If we are to do that—and I shall not vote to do it—we should do it after very careful consideration and in the full knowl-

edge of the legal effect of what we are doing, and the consequences.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask whether the Secretary of the Interior is not now authorized under the Flood Control Act to distribute and sell, under priorities, the electrical energy which is mentioned in the law and which comes within his jurisdiction.

Mr. CORDON. The Secretary of the Interior is the selling agent for all excess power at all dams operated by the Corps of Army Engineers.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the McCarran amendment in any way nullify any part of such authority?

Mr. CORDON. It does not.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has already answered the question, but in line with the same thought, is it not a fact that the McCarran amendment does not prohibit the negotiation of wheeling contracts to carry out the purposes of the Flood Control Act under which the Secretary of the Interior has the right to distribute and dispose of power?

Mr. CORDON. Would the Senator restate his question?

Mr. WHERRY. Does the McCarran amendment in any way prohibit or prevent the making of wheeling contracts to deliver the energy by the Secretary of the Interior under the Flood Control Act?

Mr. CORDON. In my opinion it does not. In my humble opinion, when we grant to the Secretary of the Interior authority to sell the power generated at the dams in such a manner as to promote its greatest usefulness, at reasonable prices and on a business basis, and so forth, there is implied the power to do those things which are necessary to be done to effect that purpose. I do not believe there is implied, however, the additional power to sell more electric energy than is turned over to him by the Corps of Army Engineers.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the question resolve itself into the situation that wheeling contracts to deliver energy under the Flood Control Act are one thing, but that the leasing of lines is quite another thing?

Mr. CORDON. Yes; and the purchase of steam plants is still another.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what the Senator says is involved in the so-called authority which has been used in connection with the revolving fund, and the McCarran amendment would hold the revolving fund to the purposes for which it was originally established. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. That is my understanding. The Senator from Nebraska referred to various steps. Let me say to him that the action of becoming a guarantor of the capital investment in both transmission lines and steam generating equipment is still quite another step. They are all involved.

Mr. WHERRY. The point I believe the membership of the Senate should have clarified is that the McCarran amendment, at least as I interpret it, in no way nullifies or countermands any

part of the Secretary's authority to make wheeling agreements.

Mr. CORDON. In my opinion it does not.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

Mr. HILL. As I understand the Senator's position it is that the language which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such a manner as to encourage the most widespread use of it, on a sound business basis, and giving preference to public bodies and co-ops, and so forth, gives him authority, as I understand the Senator's position, to enter into a wheeling contract, which is a contract to make use of somebody else's line to transmit power.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator think that it also gives him the power, if need be, to lease transmission lines?

Mr. CORDON. In my opinion it gives him power to lease transmission lines so long as the leasing of the line is for the purpose of disposing of power, and nothing else. I believe he would have that authority. I cannot understand, if we give him the authority to hire someone else to transmit the power why he should not have the authority to lease lines.

Mr. HILL. That is the reason why I asked the question.

Mr. CORDON. I do not believe there can be any question about that.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator contend that if the Administrator leased the line or had a wheeling contract, he could not send any power over it except the kilowatts of power generated at one of the dams, as provided for in the Flood Control Act?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator's question is one of those ad absurdum questions, which go beyond all reason. In the first place, Mr. President, in the case of wheeling, if the whole line is at the disposal of one person, there can be no power on it except what he puts on it, and he can take nothing off it that he did not put on. If it is a wheeling line in common use, no one else would put a kilowatt on it that could be taken off it by someone else.

Mr. HILL. If the question led to an absurdity it was suggested by the statement of the Senator from Oregon, because he seemed to emphasize the proposition that the Secretary could not dispose of power other than the power which was generated at one of the flood control dams or reservoirs.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Alabama did not understand the Senator from Oregon at all. My statement was that the quantum of power available for disposal by the Secretary could not rise above the quantum which was given him to dispose of.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Why was the figure of \$300,000 selected as the dividing line?

Mr. CORDON. I shall never know. It might just as well have been \$1,000,000 or \$30,000, or \$1,000, because it is nothing but a limitation upon the

amount of money which can be withdrawn at one time in one operation; that is all it is.

Mr. CASE. Was it sought by that means to measure the amount which might be needed for the purpose of firming power, so the contracts could be satisfied?

Mr. CORDON. In that respect we must, to a very great extent, deal in speculation. The original provision was an emergency-fund provision. The continuing fund was \$100,000. Incidentally, on that basis, a \$100,000 check could be written as often as that much money was available. However, there was a limit on the purposes for which the money could be spent, and in that case it could be spent only for emergency repairs to guarantee the continuity of what they contracted to do, namely, to deliver the power.

In this instance, in addition to the emergency use, it is possible to purchase power and to lease transmission facilities; and in that case the sky is the limit, because there is no standard by which to judge it.

Mr. CASE. Is it the Senator's opinion that the allowance of \$300,000 for the continuing fund will make it possible for the Power Administration to meet its delivery contracts with the REA's?

Mr. CORDON. In my opinion, it has nothing at all to do with that matter. I do not think this fund is needed at all in any case other than one in which these ultra vires contracts have been attempted to be put into effect; and because the local party contracts in each case, it is in no sense in pari delicto with the Government itself, which knew better. Because of that, it may be altogether right and proper that in some way we attempt to confirm the contracts, so that those who have spent their money, based on their faith that the Government was following the law and had a right to do what it did, may not lose the money they have spent by reason of that faith; and I would protect them to the last ditch.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, although the amendment refers specifically to the Southwestern Power Administration—

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt the Senator, but I had simply answered a question.

Mr. AIKEN. I thought the Senator from Oregon had concluded.

Mr. CORDON. Did the Senator from Vermont wish to ask me to yield?

Mr. AIKEN. No. Mr. President. The Senator from Oregon sat down before I rose to my feet; and then the Senator from South Dakota asked a question, and the Senator from Oregon rose to answer it.

I am willing to wait, if the Senator from Oregon has anything further to say.

Mr. CORDON. If I sat down, I did so in a moment of mental aberration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thought the Senator from Oregon had concluded, because he did sit down.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, in order that the President of the Senate may not find himself in error, as quite clearly the Senator from Vermont has,

the Senator from Oregon will now sit down.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I did not intend to preempt the position of the Senator from Oregon in any way.

Although the amendment relates specifically to the Southwestern Power Administration, it has been brought to the point where it goes considerably beyond a matter involving the Southwestern Power Administration alone, because what is determined in the case of this particular area might well apply to any other part of the United States. In fact, as I view the amendment now, it goes beyond the controversy of public power versus private power, and raises the question of whether and to what extent Government should engage in business at all.

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that sometimes we in the Senate are not given an opportunity to choose a moderate course. We find controversy, with those on either side very adamant in their opinions and very unyielding in their methods. We seem to have such a case before us at this time. On the one hand, we have the power companies of the United States, who undoubtedly would do away with TVA, municipal power plants, the REA, and all public power development, except as they might control the power, at the first opportunity they have. In fact, it appears that they are campaigning toward that end at this very time. On the other hand, we have some of the disciples of public power, so ardent in their views that undoubtedly they would make all the power systems in the United States public if they had their way. Neither one of them is correct.

Mr. President, each of us has to set up his own criterion in deciding how he will vote on the question of whether the Government shall engage in business in any particular form. So far as I am concerned, the criterion which I use in deciding how I shall vote on the matter of Government in business, will the Government by engaging in any operation or business make it possible to expand and make more profitable private industry in general? If the Government does things which private industry is unable to do for itself, and therefore makes it possible for more persons to do more business in private industry, then I think such a program is justifiable.

We have several examples of that, cases in which the Government has gone into business for the general good of private industry and the country as a whole. Probably our first example was the establishment of the public-school system. It was deemed good for the country as a whole to do away with illiteracy by providing for education.

We have the Post Office as one of the oldest examples in the United States of Government in business. The Government set up the postal system because that made it possible for private business to prosper.

We have our great system of highways, which was developed a little later, superseding the system of private toll roads and toll bridges, because as our commerce grew, it was determined that it was better for private industry in gen-

eral to have the highways and the bridges publicly owned.

We have the development of our harbors by public funds, because it was impossible for the individual shipping interests which use the harbors to develop them by themselves.

More recently we have the development of airports; practically all of which are publicly owned and publicly operated, because obviously it was uneconomic for the airlines to build their own airports and operate them themselves.

So we have those examples of the Government engaging in business and thereby making private industry more profitable and making it possible for more persons to become engaged in private industry.

Within the past 20 years we have seen the development of public power systems, mostly generating plants. These, for the most part, have been developed where the power was an incidental part of a complete Government program, as in the case of the multiple-purpose dams, or of giant developments such as Hoover Dam, Bonneville, and Grand Coulee, where the cost of the development was so high that no one private concern could engage in it. So, in making up our minds as to how we should vote on this amendment relating specifically to the Southwestern Power Administration, we must decide whether it is in the interest of private industry to permit the Southwestern Power Administration to lease lines and to buy power to firm up its own power so that it may better serve the private industry in that great area.

The Southwestern Power Authority is a good example of public power, an example of Government engaging in business. Other examples are the public power districts of other areas of the country, notably Nebraska. We also have an example of municipal distribution systems scattered throughout the country which are public developments. On the other hand, we have the private utility corporations as perfect examples of private industry. We also have the REA, which serves, I think, 3,000,000 farm homes of this country, as another type of private industry.

The question we have to ask before voting on this amendment is this: If we give the Southwestern Power Administration authority to lease lines or to purchase power in order to firm up its own supply of power, will it better serve its private customers and enhance the private economy of that area as a whole? Or will we, by adopting the McCarran amendment, deny the Southwestern Power Administration the right to buy power and thereby force the sale of that which it now produces to other distributing companies at dump power rates? In this particular case, however, the question, it appears, is not so direct as that. The question, I understand, is whether the amendment itself is germane to the pending bill. So far as I am concerned, it appears that if the Southwestern Power Administration has had the right to lease lines and purchase power over the past 2 years and if contracts under this authority have already been made, then it appears that any proposal to

repeal this authority becomes definitely a matter of legislation and is definitely not a matter to be incorporated by way of an amendment into an appropriation bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to address two or three questions, if I may, to the Senator from Oregon, if he will indulge me by permitting me to address questions to him. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that I was deeply impressed by his speech, and particularly by two points which he made in it, which I want to be very sure I understand correctly, and which I should like to have further reflected in the Record, so that at least my understanding may appear therein.

In the first place, I understood the Senator from Oregon to say that he objected to the present proposal with reference to the Southwestern Power Administration's operations, in that it permitted, through the use over and over again of this so-called revolving fund, of the use of receipts monthly, and from month to month, up to the amount of \$300,000; and in that it permitted the expenditure of sums vastly larger than \$300,000, without their having been cleared through Congress, without their having been made the basis of any appropriation, and without their being expended as the result of Congress having authorized such expenditure. Is the Senator from Florida correct in his understanding that that was one of the principal points made by the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Florida is entirely correct. The Senator from Oregon endeavored to make himself clear on that proposition; and that is his view. If the Senator from Florida will indulge me, I should like to say that in the ordinary operation of the particular provision of the bill we are considering, and if we utterly forget its legal effect, if we are not willing to apply the rule which I think should always be applied by lawmakers, to test the law by what can be done under it, not by what is expected to be done, I think we could reach the conclusion that the probabilities in this field do not at all approach the possibilities. Very frankly I doubt that, if any sound system of bookkeeping is set-up in the particular area, there would ever be the necessity of the use of \$1. But it could be used; and that is the only point.

I should also like to touch upon one other thing.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should be glad if the Senator would elaborate his answer.

Mr. CORDON. The danger I see in this type of operation lies here in this: I take it that Federal money ought to be in the Federal Treasury, and since every dollar received from the operation of the facilities concerned is Federal money, we can deem it to be money which should be in the Federal Treasury, and if expenditures are to be made from the Federal Treasury, and an application for the amount of money is made to the Congress, then the two Houses of the Congress will have an opportunity to scan carefully the application, and to require such justification as may be

deemed necessary. That will be first in committee, and then in the two Houses. Then, at least, the people may know that their representatives, who are not appointed, but who are elected, have passed judgment not only upon the legality of the action, but also upon the advisability of it.

On the other hand, under what is proposed, there is no control by any elected officials of the Federal Government; the contract is made between an appointive administrative agency of the Federal Government and a group who, of course, have the greatest possible interest in the development, naturally, because it is to serve them. There is no check by any elected group of people of the United States with respect to the expenditure of Federal money, if we permit this sort of use of money to guarantee the construction of lines. Remember, it is not to be used to construct lines, it is not to be used to build steam plants, it is to be used to guarantee the payments so the plants can be built.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield, if I may.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the Senator a question based upon a statement made in the RECORD yesterday by the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who, I am glad to see, is present in the Chamber at this time. In response to a question addressed to the Senator from Oklahoma by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], as shown on page 7979 of yesterday's RECORD, the junior Senator from Oklahoma, speaking of the use of this revolving fund, and of the amount of the fund, made this reply:

It would not be turned over more than once a month, at the most.

The Senator from Florida understood that to mean that this \$300,000, if the details of the purchase and sale of power required it under the operation, for monthly bills and the monthly payment of those bills, could be turned over in its entire amount once a month, which would mean an expenditure in the course of a year of \$3,600,000, assuming that the fund could be perfectly used each month; which might not be the case. Assuming, however, that the fund might be so used, is it the point of the Senator from Oregon that through an uncontrolled use of the fund an expenditure of \$3,600,000 a year might be made under the current operations of the Southwestern Power Administration without Congress having authorized any of that expenditure, and without Congress having appropriated any of the \$3,600,000 to be expended during that year?

Mr. CORDON. It is clear from the language of the act which is now on the statute books that the limit upon the amount of money which can be expended is measured by the total amount of money which has been paid into the Federal Treasury through the Southwestern Power Administration. It is not limited to \$3,600,000 or to \$10,000,000, if that much money has been paid in. It is limited, of course, by the use to which the money is to be put. The greatest

danger rests in the fact that this almost fantastic possibility would be realized, that there would be contracts continuing on for years and years to which the funds would be pledged, and which would face some future Congress as a very strong and compelling moral obligation, even though perhaps there was no legal obligation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may propound a question to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the Senator from Nevada for the purpose which he has stated, without my losing the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. The more that is paid in by the Southwestern Power Administration the more there is to pay out, and as the fund expands from year to year the amount paid in becomes greater. Is not that true?

Mr. CORDON. The only way to answer that question is to say that the provision is a blank check against the gross receipts of the Southwestern Power Administration. This is the most extreme situation that could be presented: The Secretary could write checks of \$300,000 as long as the purpose of the expenditure was within the limits of the provision, just as rapidly as each check came in and was cleared, so that the fund would have to be replenished, and the contingent claim for the fund is equal to the total amount of the gross receipts.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it correct to say that the only limitation upon the operation, under the existing law, is the size of the operation, in dollars and cents, of the Southwestern Power Administration in any given year?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct. Of course, if the operation is in good faith and there is a purchase of electricity, or there is a rental of a line and the line has been used and electricity has been sold, when the sale is made the money goes back to the Treasury subject to the same lien. That is the vice of it.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will yield further, there is another point in the remarks of the Senator from Oregon which is of particular interest. If the Senator from Florida correctly understood the Senator from Oregon, it was the view of the Senator from Oregon that the matter of enlargement of the public power program by the acquisition and construction of steam-power facilities was a legislative matter, and that in each case it was necessary to be considered in the light of its impact upon the entire program and should be adopted or rejected by the Congress as a legislative matter. Is that understanding correct?

Mr. CORDON. It is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. In other words, to use the TVA as an illustration rather than the national power venture, the Senator from Oregon means that in the case of the TVA it was entirely proper for the Congress, in connection with the so-called Johnsonville project, to consider the problem as to whether Congress

felt that the steam plant, if constructed and added to the power units in the TVA, would be a justifiable addition to the whole program, but that the Johnsonville project was one which could not be determined by anyone other than the Congress. Am I correct in my understanding of the position taken by the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CORDON. That is my view. The funds used by TVA in the ordinary course of business can be used for business purposes, separate and apart from going back into the Treasury. But there are limitations on the use.

Mr. HOLLAND. Under the Flood Control Act, the Senator from Oregon meant to take the position, and does take the position, does he not, that the enlargement of the program by the acquisition or construction of a steam power plant is always a legislative matter, and that the legislative jurisdiction may not be properly bypassed through such means as are now being used in connection with the Southwestern Power Administration's operations under the current law?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator has made the statement much more clearly than did the Senator from Oregon. That is my view in a nutshell.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I have one more question, if the Senator will yield further. Is it a fair statement of the position of the Senator from Oregon that he feels that the current operation, under which, both as to transmission lines and as to steam power plants, the Southwestern Power Administration is operating under long-term leases which would permit the payment of the entire cost of construction of either the transmission lines or the steam power plants over a period of years, and at the end of the period would make it possible for the Administration to acquire for a nominal amount the transmission lines and the steam power plant, is a patent method of bypassing congressional jurisdiction to determine whether transmission lines and steam power plants should be acquired by the Southwestern Power Administration as an arm of the Federal Government?

Mr. CORDON. That would appear to be perfectly clear. Of course, the Senator is familiar with the rule which the courts have announced time after time, that that which the law prohibits doing directly may not be done by indirection.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is, then, the opinion of the Senator from Oregon, is it not, that, just as the question of the wisdom of establishing the steam plant at Johnsonville or the question of the wisdom of building a transmission line in Montana—

Mr. CORDON. Or in Oregon.

Mr. HOLLAND. Or in Oregon or Montana or Oklahoma or Colorado was a question exclusively addressed to the legislative judgment, discretion, and determination of the Congress, so the acquisition of any steam power plant or any transmission line by the Southwestern Power Administration should be likewise reserved entirely, as a question of jurisdiction, discretion, and judgment, to

the legislative authority, namely, the Congress of the United States?

Mr. CORDON. I agree entirely, and I think we are both supported by the Constitution of the United States in that position.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I yield now to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida realizes, of course, that when the Southwestern Power Administration, instead of coming to Congress to ask to have a Government-built transmission line, makes a contract for the wheeling of the power generated, that is, contracts with a private utility to carry the power to the cooperative or to the public body to which the Southwestern Power Administration is sending the power, of course the Southwestern Power Administration has to pay, and should properly, pay the private utility for the service rendered?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida well understands that, but the Senator from Florida regards it as at least a very grave question as to whether the Southwestern Power Administration should charge such a sum as would enable it not only to pay a fair price for the power from time to time, but also to amortize the entire construction cost of the steam power plant or of the transmission line, so that at the end of a stated period of years the cost would be fully paid, and so that as a result of the contract the Southwestern Power Administration, for a nominal consideration, would have the right to claim delivery to it, as its own asset, of the steam power plant or transmission line.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. In one moment.

The Senator from Florida realizes, does he not, that, so far as the facilities which are owned by the Southwestern Power Administration are concerned, the law itself, section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, requires a rate schedule that will include the amortization of the capital investment allocated to power for a reasonable period of years? Certainly there is nothing unsound about that, is there, that there be such a rate charged that the Government will get back the money which it has invested in the dams and power facilities? The Senator certainly has no objection to that, has he?

Mr. HOLLAND. What the Senator from Florida is inclined to object to and on which he is trying to bring the facts out crystal clear for the Record, is that the Southwestern Power Administration, rather than the rural electrification cooperatives, which are supposed to be the beneficiary of the power to borrow from the Rural Electrification Administration, is writing into its contracts such a rate that at a given time in the future, by the payment of a merely nominal sum, it, the Southwestern Power Administration, becomes the owner, and is entitled to be the owner, of both the power plant and the transmission lines, and thereby has successfully bypassed the Congress, and has failed to present to the Congress that specific matter for determination, as it

did present similar matters to the Eighty-first Congress in connection with the proposed construction of transmission lines in Oklahoma and in Missouri.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question there?

Mr. HILL. I can answer the Senator's question. The senior Senator from Oklahoma, who lives in Oklahoma and who lives with this matter, seems very anxious to answer it, however.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator know that this leasing contract does not affect the ownership of the steam generating plant at all?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida is not so well acquainted with the details as he would like to be, but he heard his friend from Oklahoma state—unless he wholly misunderstood him—that for the payment, in the case of the transmission line, of the nominal sum of \$10 at the end of a period of years, the Southwestern Power Administration would have the right, under an option which it had written into the contract, to bypass the law and to bypass the submission of this matter to legislative consideration at the hands of the Congress, and to become itself the owner of the transmission lines. That in the case of the power plants the Senator from Florida was following closely his friend the Senator from Oklahoma. He did not hear him say \$10, but he did say "for a minor consideration."

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a correction of the impression he has? The Senator from Oklahoma would like to clear up the question the Senator from Florida has in his mind.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I wish to say that the leasing contract would not have anything in the world to do with the power plant. It has to do only with the high-voltage transmission line. The contract permits the Southwestern Power Administration to lease this line for the reason that it will be available for the handling of the output from the steam plant which is built by the rural electric cooperative, owned by it, and retained by it, with no provision in the agreement with the Southwestern Power Administration relating to it, or the title to it, or an option with reference to it whatsoever, but only with reference to the high-voltage line which will be used by the Southwestern Power Administration.

The understanding is that the line will be available not only to carry the output of the steam plant, but also to carry the power which the Southwestern Power Administration gets from the hydroelectric project. The lease rental provides for a sufficient payment over the 40-year period to enable the cooperative to meet its commitments to the Rural Electrification Administration for principal and interest until the loan is paid. Then, as I stated, as a measure of thrift, or whatever one may care to call it, there is a provision in the contract that at that time the Southwestern

Power Administration has the option to buy the high-voltage transmission line. I think for—

Mr. HOLLAND. For \$10.

Mr. KERR. For \$10. But it cannot do that without coming to the Congress and asking for the authority to do it and the appropriation with which to pay for it.

I should like also to clear up one other point in the Senator's mind.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let the Senator from Florida say briefly what he thinks about the \$10 provision. He does not believe at all that the Southwestern Power Administration would have to come to Congress for a \$10 appropriation. He thinks the \$10 might very easily come out of the pocket of the manager, or any farmer or any citizen who was interested, and that this device represents a bypassing of the will of the Congress. In other words there is an avoidance of a contest in the very field which developed here during the Eighty-first Congress, when, as the Senator from Oklahoma knows, there was very real diversity of opinion here as to the wisdom of the acquisition of certain transmission lines by agencies of the Federal Government. By the device now proposed a complete bypassing is accomplished, it seems to the Senator from Florida.

It seems likewise to the Senator from Florida that this should not be regarded as merely a thrifty arrangement on the part of the manager of the Southwestern Power Administration. He does not know the manager, and he does not want to deprive him of any credit whatsoever, but it seems to the Senator from Florida that, if the volume of business is such, and the rates charged for handling the business are such, that instead of the REA association which is involved retaining and claiming and continuing to own the transmission line at the end of a period of years, the Southwestern Power Administration instead becomes the owner by the payment of a mere song. Instead of this being a matter of thrift, it would appear that a larger rate has been paid than a rate which was simply sufficient to allow the carrying on of the Southwestern Power Administration's business as such, because somewhere along the line, out of that operation the entire capital cost has been repaid from the operating revenue.

So it seems to the Senator from Florida that there is at least a definite question as to whether this arrangement is thrifty, or is not, instead, at a rate greater than the minimum rate which would be allowed if a mere nonprofit operation of the purchase and sale of power was what was being carried on by the operation of the Southwestern Power Administration.

Mr. KERR. If the Senator from Florida will yield for one further observation, in the first place, there is more than \$10 involved in acquiring title to this facility.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida heard the Senator from Oklahoma state several times on the floor that \$10 was the amount which, when

paid at the end of a period of years, would entitle the Southwestern Power Administration to claim and receive title to the transmission lines.

Mr. KERR. Yes; but the Senator from Oklahoma made it very clear that the Administrator had to come to Congress, not only to get the \$10, but to get the authority to acquire the facility. He does not under the present law, nor under the continuing-fund provision, have the authority ever to acquire title to the facility. Nor can he ever acquire it until Congress gives him such authority. I tried to make it clear that when he comes to Congress he must come not only for the \$10, but also for the authority to acquire the facility.

With reference to the amount of the lease charges over the 40 years, which amortize the cost of the facility, I say to the distinguished Senator that that cost must be in the rate. Whoever amortizes the facility, whoever receives the revenue from it, must have an item in the rate which will be sufficient to pay for the power and to amortize the cost of the facility.

In that regard, not only is it done on a basis to which the REA cooperatives are agreeable, but it is done on the basis on which they have sought to have it done, because, by reason of its being done, and by reason of the high-voltage transmission facility being available not only to handle the output of the steam plant, but also the hydroelectric power, they are assured of a greater supply, an abundant supply of power, and at a far cheaper rate than they have ever yet been able to get, and cheaper than any rate which is available to them at the present time under any other arrangement which is possible to them. Although it is at a lesser rate, and although it is for an abundant supply of power, it is at a rate which permits the inclusion of the amount necessary for the amortization.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. However, it seems to the Senator from Florida that it is very patent in this whole matter that the rates must be made sufficient to amortize the whole capital cost. If they are so made, it seems to the Senator from Florida that the purpose of the original Federal law is being circumvented if anyone other than the rural electrification association is to have title to this facility, which the members of the association themselves have made possible. The Senator from Florida is not prepared to give his blanket endorsement to any arrangement under which the head of the Federal agency serving many of these associations is permitted to enter into such contracts, said by the Senator from Oklahoma—and undoubtedly believed by him—to be wholly voluntary on the part of the association, but with respect to which the Senator from Florida feels there might frequently be a question as to whether they were voluntary. It is not human nature to expect people to pay for something by rates which they are paying, and then to proceed to hand it over, for a nominal payment of \$10, to an arm of the United States Govern-

ment when they get through paying for it.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further observation?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. In the first place, the Senator from Florida says that he does not believe that that provision should be in the contract. I stated a little while ago that the Administrator had said, both publicly and privately, that if the Senate did not want him to have that additional provision in his contract he would gladly eliminate it. Further—

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him right there, I understood the Senator to say that if the Senate had decided that it did not want the Administrator to have a prudent and frugal operation, and would so instruct him, he would abandon this prudent and frugal operation, at the expense of the members of the rural electrification association, and would take that provision out. That is entirely different from the statement—at least, as the Senator from Florida now understands it—which is now advanced by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I tried to make it perfectly clear that I was speaking for the Administrator in saying that at any time the Senate advised him that it did not approve of that provision in his contract he would remove it.

Mr. HOLLAND. But the Senator from Oklahoma spoke of it repeatedly as frugal and prudent management. The Senator from Florida does not feel that management is frugal and prudent when it permits the head of a Federal agency in effect to impose rates under which the members pay out the capital cost, through money which they pay from month to month for the power which they use, and then, at the end of a period of years, hand over to an arm of the Federal Government the asset which they have bought with money out of their own pockets. The Senator from Florida does not think that that is frugal. He would use a different word in describing that operation.

Mr. KERR. Regardless of what word the Senator might use to describe it, the sentiment which I expressed remains the same, that the Administrator has stated that if the Senate does not desire that provision in the contract, he will take it out. Furthermore, if the Senator from Florida is curious about what the REA's in the Southwest think about it, let me say that their representatives are sitting in the gallery. They are now in Washington begging every Senator who will listen to them please not to approve this amendment, because if this amendment is adopted it will result in their having less power at a higher rate.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

On that point the Senator from Florida is not at all adamant with respect to public purchase or construction and operation, in proper cases, of steam power plants or transmission lines. For ex-

ample, the Senator from Florida voted for the Johnsonville steam power plant in the TVA. The Senator from Florida has personally appeared before the Rural Electrification Administrator, in company with his good friend the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], in connection with the granting of a loan for the construction of a steam plant facility which the Senator from Florida believed was completely necessary and completely justified by the purposes of the original REA Act. Originally the plant was intended to be constructed at the gracious city of Andalusia, Ala., but I believe, under later plans, it was placed at some other site.

The Senator from Florida has also appeared before the same REA Administrator in furtherance of a program for the construction of another steam plant in Florida which, by reason of certain concessions made by the commercial power companies in his State, did not prove in the final analysis to be needed. However, the Senator from Florida is inclined unyieldingly to take the position that there is a legislative question which always ought to be addressed to the judgment of the Congress. He does not take that position to the degree that he is not willing to be persuaded by the dulcet tones and the engaging and always pleasing manner of his friend from Oklahoma, but he is rather strongly of that opinion. The Senator from Florida is bound to feel in this instance that the manipulation—and he does not use that term as indicative of anything fraudulent—of this act under the practices which he has learned largely from the exposition of those practices as given by the Senator from Oklahoma which is now taking place in Oklahoma, is such that the facilities, whether plants or transmission lines, are paid for, and then, at the end of the payment, the right is claimed by an arm of the Government, for a nominal consideration, to have such facilities go to an arm of the Federal Government, the Southwestern Power Administration, instead of to the good people who paid for them.

The Senator from Florida feels that that is questionable from two points of view. First, he fears that the good people who approve that project because they want the power so badly would much rather have the property for themselves when they get through paying for it. It is only human nature for them to feel that way. Secondly, he feels that it is always improper for an administrative agency, having found that it is rather difficult to impress Congress with some of its programs, to go out in the field and bypass the attitude which it has found in Congress, by adopting a contractual practice which accomplishes the purpose which Congress approved reluctantly and only in strong cases.

Therefore, the Senator from Florida, without finding any fault at all with the senior Senator from Oklahoma, his junior colleague, or the citizens of Oklahoma, feels that if the Senate finds a practice which is bypassing its own jurisdiction and authority, in which it is very

heavily divided, because much opinion is found on both sides of the question, and if it likewise finds that a practice is under way which it believes might be used adversely to the interests of the rural people who comprise the memberships of REA associations, it is the duty of the Senate and of Congress to take a position which will prevent an operation which will bring about either of the two results. The Senator from Florida feels those two result are not good results, and he much prefers to have members of the REA associations everywhere in the Nation safeguarded, and to have the jurisdiction and responsibilities of Congress performed right here, rather than by decision of some administrator in the field, who might or might not scrupulously observe the rights of the people who are intended to be the beneficiaries of this Federal program, namely, the rural people who are members of the REA associations.

Mr. CORDON, Mr. HILL, and Mr. KERR addressed the Chair.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, sometime ago I promised to yield to the Senator from Oregon. I do so now.

Mr. CORDON. Would the Senator from Florida permit me to make a statement at this time in order that the RECORD may be complete? It is actually in answer to a question which was asked of me by the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] earlier in the day. I have before me a record from which I should like to answer the question of the Senator from Oklahoma, if the Senator from Florida will permit me to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I made the statement that I thought it was timely to adopt the committee amendment in order that there might not be more contracts of this type made before Congress could thoroughly study the subject and reach a sound conclusion. I call attention to the fact that a contract was made before the enactment of the provision giving any authority to make any such contract. I should like to have the RECORD show the figures involved. A contract, which appears in the hearings, was made between the SPA and the Western Electric Cooperative of Oklahoma. It carries the date of the 4th day of August 1949. The \$300,000 continuing fund was provided for by an amendment to the 1950 appropriation bill, which was considered in 1949. The committee recommended that it be not approved. The amendment, with a slight modification, was offered on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Oklahoma. It was adopted on the floor. The bill containing it was passed by the Senate on August 25, 1949, and it became law on October 12, 1949. The contract was negotiated certainly some time before the bill was signed, and it is a rather long contract. As I have said, it was signed on the 4th day of August 1949. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I now yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, of course the Senator from Florida is familiar with

the REA Act, and he realizes that the period of amortization under the REA Act is 40 years. The transmission lines which the Senator has been discussing were built by the REA cooperatives, with loans from the REA. The leasing contracts with the Southwestern Power Administration not only provide for a leasing of the lines during the 40-year amortization period, but they also provide that the Southwestern Power Administration shall bear the cost of maintenance, repair, and upkeep of the lines.

The thought was that at the end of 40 long years the Southwestern Power Administration would have put so much into the lines, by way of repair, new material, and labor in maintaining them for that long period, that really and truly they would be, at the end of the 40 years, the property of the Southwestern Power Administration, on the theory that the Southwestern Power Administration had put so much into the lines. That was the reason why both sides, the REA cooperatives and the Southwestern Power Administration, thought it would be equitable to provide for the purchase, if Congress saw fit in its wisdom to authorize a fund to buy the lines. That was the reason for it. There was nothing unusual about the contract. It was just a good business proposition from the standpoint of the REA.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida does not question the good motives of anyone who was involved in the undertaking. However, he does wish to call attention to the fact that if it be true, as has been stated by his good friend from Alabama [Mr. HILL]—and he is certain that his good friend from Alabama believes it to be true or he would not advance the idea—that at the end of a period of years the amount of money put up by the Southwestern Power Administration was sufficient to justify its becoming the owner, the Senator from Florida calls attention to the fact that every dime that was used during that period of years to accomplish that result was Federal money, because that is the only kind of money that the Southwestern Power Administration is able to use.

Therefore, the result would be that through a period of years of payments, chips and whetstones, the Southwestern Power Administration, without specific appropriation and without Congress having passed on the question of the wisdom or unwisdom of construction or acquisition of a transmission line, would have become the owner of that transmission line. Thereby the authority of Congress to hear that specific matter and to pass upon it one way or another would be completely defeated.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. I should like to continue with my statement. The money which the Senator from Alabama says would have been paid over the years by the Southwestern Power Administration would have been Federal money. Therefore the facility, the Senator from Ala-

bama argues, should become Federal property.

The Senator from Florida calls attention to the fact that all of that operation would have been without the approval of Congress, and it would have bypassed the Congress.

In the second instance, the Senator from Florida calls attention to the fact that there is at least a question as to whether it was all Federal money, because, as the Senator from Florida sees the matter, there is certainly a good probability that much of that money reflects expenditures out of the pockets of the members of the REA's, for whose benefit the loans were made.

The manipulation of the matter, as disclosed here, in that case would result in depriving those REA members, those equitable owners of the property, of their right to the property, and would bring it into Federal hands, again by-passing its submission to the Federal legislative body, the Congress. One or the other must be true.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to conclude my discussion of the point. One or the other must be true. Either the money which is paid out for the facilities is Federal money, in which case it has been spent without Federal authorization, and has bypassed congressional authority; or it was local money, belonging to the people who are members of the REA's. The net result through this contract will be to deprive them of the investment which they made over that long period of years. The Senator from Florida does not wish to be heard supporting either one of those developments, because either one of them, it seems to him, is equally bad. He does not care to be put in the position of approving such a program.

Now I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. So far as Federal funds are concerned, they are Federal funds in the sense that a Federal agency is running the power distribution in the area, and the funds come from that agency.

Mr. HOLLAND. In other words, they are Federal funds.

Mr. HILL. Yes; in that sense they are Federal funds.

Mr. HOLLAND. In that case, would not the result of this proposal be to allow the expenditure over a period of years of Federal money and the acquisition by one arm of the Federal Government of a transmission line or a facility which up to this time the Congress has been insisting should come before it for approval or disapproval?

Mr. HILL. Here is what this proposal would amount to: The REA cooperatives would lease the line to the Federal agency, namely, the Southwestern Power Administration. Power would be carried over the line to the REA cooperatives from the Southwestern Power Administration, and the Southwestern Power Administration would pay for the lease; and, in turn, the REA cooperatives would pay for the power they received.

However, the contract went further, and provided that the REA cooperatives,

the owners of the line, those who have the fee simple title to it, would not be required to keep it up. Of course, Mr. President, when there is a landlord-and-tenant relationship, the landlord usually keeps up the property, unless there is a contrary provision in the contract. However, in this case it was provided in the contract that not only would the Government lease the line and furnish the power to the REA cooperatives, but the Government also would maintain the line. It was provided that the lease would be a long one, for 40 or 41 years. By the end of that period, the Government will have put so much into the lines, by way of maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, and upkeep, that the lines probably will have been more or less paid for by the Government. So there was included in the contract a provision to the effect that at the end of the 40-year period the Government would have an option to buy. There is nothing unusual about that.

However, before the Southwestern Power Administration can buy, it must obtain from Congress authority to make the purchase and must obtain from Congress the funds with which to purchase. At the end of 40 years, if the distinguished Senator from Florida is still a Member of the Senate and if I am still a Member of the Senate—and I hope both of us will be Members of the Senate at that time—we shall participate in the determination by the Senate of whether the Government will exercise its option to buy the line or lines. Before the agency can buy the line or lines, Congress must authorize it and must appropriate the funds needed for that purpose.

There is nothing unusual about this contract, in other words, except that it is for a long period—up to 40 years. We know that often when there is a long contract—one for 40 or 50 years, or perhaps for a longer period of time—there are provisions of this kind. If the tenant is going to put a great deal of money into the repair and upkeep of the property, amounting in many instances to rebuilding the property, the tenant is given an option to purchase the property at the end of the long leasing period.

However, before the purchase can be made in this case, the senior Senator from Florida—who, as I said, I hope will be a Member of the Senate at that time—or whoever then is, in-part, representing the State of Florida in the Senate, will have to share in the determination by the Senate of the question of whether the purchase shall be made and whether the funds needed for that purpose shall be appropriated.

Mr. HOLLAND. At least both the Senator from Alabama and I can agree in hoping that we shall be in the Senate at that time.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. However, I wish to inquire of the Senator from Alabama whether the provision of the contract actually requires affirmative action by the Federal Government at the end of the period of time. I invite the Senator from Alabama to place that provision of the contract in the Record at this point.

Mr. HILL. I do not have a copy of the contract.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I have a copy of the contract, if the Senator will yield to me for that purpose.

Mr. HILL. I have a copy of the law which gives the Southwestern Power Administration authority to construct or acquire lines; and the law says, in part:

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, from funds appropriated by the Congress, to construct or acquire—

So Congress must pass on this matter; there is no by-passing of Congress in connection with it.

The truth of the matter is, let me say to my friend the Senator from Florida—

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I invite the Senator from Alabama to place in the Record either the entire contract or the portion of it which deals with the option to which reference has been made, because I would be shocked beyond measure if it appears, upon inspection of that provision, that there is a specific requirement that the \$10 cannot be paid unless Congress takes affirmative action at that time.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to read that provision of the contract?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to have the Senator place the contract in the Record.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield further to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to say that I can understand the position the Senator from Florida takes in regard to this matter, but I am sure he also sees the other side of the picture.

The chances are that if during the 40-year period the Government, through the Southwestern Power Administration, put thousands or millions of dollars into the upkeep of the transmission lines—

Mr. HOLLAND. If it did, it would be putting Federal money into them.

Mr. HILL. That is right, and that is the very reason why the Government should have the opportunity to purchase at the end of that time.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is the very reason why I think that if there is a prospect of expending millions of dollars of Federal money during that period of time—and that is the figure now used by the Senator from Alabama—the question of whether those millions of dollars of Federal money should be so invested is a proper one for the Congress to determine, not for an Administrator in the field to determine.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Each and every year the Southwestern Power Administration has to come before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations to have that question considered, and then it is considered by the full House Ap-

propriations Committee, and then by the House of Representatives itself; and, later on, consideration is given to it in the Senate. The question has to come, first, before the subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and then before the full Senate Appropriations Committee, and then before the Senate itself. It must also come before the Bureau of the Budget.

However, I say to the Senator from Florida that the question before us now is not one of whether the policy was right or wrong. The dams were built for flood-control purposes, and in that connection certain power was developed. Certainly the Government would not want that power to go to waste. The wise and businesslike thing to do was to sell the power. If the power is to be sold, and is to be sold as the law provides, namely, on a sound and businesslike basis, then the Administration has to have some flexibility of operation, subject always to a check each year by the Congress and by the Bureau of the Budget and by the Comptroller General.

Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further—

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will examine the Bonneville Power Act, he will see that in that act the broadest kind of power was provided, as was necessary, so that the Bonneville Power Administration could operate on a sound, businesslike basis.

We cannot sit back and say, "We cannot give this authority or that authority," and then let the taxpayers' property be wasted and not get the best we can from the property. We certainly would not be very good trustees if we proceeded in that way.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the remarks of the Senator from Alabama point up the fact that exactly what should not be accomplished is being accomplished, this property does become the taxpayers' property—the Senator from Alabama has just so referred to it—without having the Congress ever pass upon it.

Mr. President, I ask the Senate to recall—as can very easily be done by all Senators who were in the Senate during the last Congress—that on the specific question of the acquisition or construction of certain transmission lines, this very Southwestern Power Administration came before the Eighty-first Congress and found the Congress to be decidedly divided on the question of the wisdom or unwisdom of each of those programs. Certain of the programs were modified, and they had to be abandoned to that extent. Certain of them were approved by the Congress.

It is evident to the Senator from Florida that this device now being used and now under debate on the floor either is or could easily be a bypass to avoid the submission to Congress of the very debatable question of the wisdom of constructing any particular transmission line. It is so obvious to the Senator from Florida that this is in the nature of a subterfuge, or could be made so, that he does not, by his vote, want to approve

its continuance; because it is clear that those supporting the set-up regard it as a matter under which millions of dollars—and I now quote the Senator from Alabama—"of public or Federal money"—and again I quote the Senator from Alabama—"can be expended during the years"—and I am still quoting the Senator from Alabama—"without any authority, by way of appropriation by Congress, and that this property could become Federal property"—and again I quote the Senator from Alabama—"without Congress ever having once been given the chance to decide the wisdom or unwisdom of the acquisition of the particular transmission line."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will yield, he misquotes me, if I may say so.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida does not intend to misquote the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Florida certainly misquotes me when he says that I said that this property by which I take it he means these transmission lines, could become the property of the Federal Government without action on the part of the Congress. I cited to the Senator the very provision of the law which requires approval by the Congress, and the fact that these lines cannot be acquired except by direct appropriation from the Treasury by the Congress.

I should like to say further to the Senator, if I may—

Mr. HOLLAND. But the Senator from Alabama, in his later statement, said that the property of the Federal Government ought to be safeguarded.

Mr. HILL. Yes; and the Senator from Florida knows that these transmission lines today are not the property of the Federal Government. The titles of the transmission lines are in the REA cooperatives, and when I said that the property of the Federal Government ought to be safeguarded, I meant exactly what I said. I referred to property to which the Federal Government holds title in fee simple, namely, the dams and reservoirs which the Government has built, and which the Government, of course, now owns.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida had no expectation of being drawn into an extended debate, but he feels very keenly that there is a question of retention of the jurisdiction and authority of Congress to pass upon substantial investments of public funds; which question is being ignored and bypassed by following the practice which prevails under the current law; a practice which he does not believe is sound. He thinks that that practice is objectionable upon either of two grounds: It may result in mistreatment of the members, themselves, of the rural electrification associations, whose property these transmission lines really ought to be; or it may result in the taking of this action and the commitment of the Federal Government to the expenditure of millions of dollars of Federal money without consideration by Congress, and without appropriation by Congress; and at the end of a few years it may result in having a huge federally owned power-

distributing organization in the area which is served by the Southwestern Power Administration, without the Congress having, from this moment on, passed upon the wisdom or the unwisdom of the extension of transmission lines. From both standpoints, the Senator from Florida thinks that such a procedure is unsound and is an abdication of the responsibilities of Congress which cannot be contemplated with any degree of pleasure by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I desire to place in the RECORD, with the permission of the Senator, the paragraph from the contract which gives the option to purchase, together with a statement concerning section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, which is the existing law.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would the Senator mind putting the entire contract in the RECORD?

Mr. KERR. I do not have the entire contract; but, if the Senator desires it, I will get a copy of it and give it to him. I am placing in the RECORD that for which he asked, and that is the option provision of the contract. If the Senator wants the entire contract I will secure it and give it to him.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will appreciate that, if the Senator will do so. May I see the paper to which the Senator refers?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma ask that the paragraph and statement be placed in the RECORD as part of his remarks?

Mr. KERR. I do.

There being no objection, the paragraph from the contract, together with a statement regarding section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPTION TO PURCHASE

Grant: The cooperative hereby grants to the Government the exclusive right, at the option of the Government, to purchase the transmission system (a) at any time during the term of this agreement and lease for a sum equal to the principal of the cooperative's REA loan attributable to the transmission system, less the actual amount of the rental payments theretofore made by the Government on account of the principal of the cooperative's REA loan attributable to the transmission system, and (b) upon the expiration of the term of this agreement and lease for the sum of \$10. In the event the Government is in default as to any payments under this agreement at the time it exercises its option hereunder, the Government shall be required to pay all payments in arrears before exercising its option hereunder.

STATEMENT

The funds for the purchase of the transmission lines of the various cooperatives could not be used from the continuing fund but must be approved and appropriated specifically by Congress.

WHY DOES THIS HAVE TO BE DONE?

I have pointed out that the continuing fund does not authorize the construction or purchase of any transmission facilities. The only authority for SPA to construct or acquire transmission lines is contained in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, which reads as follows: "The Secretary of the In-

terior is authorized, from funds to be appropriated by the Congress, to construct or acquire, by purchase or other agreement, only such transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated—available in wholesale quantities." Under this authority SPA submits annually to the Congress its estimate for construction. In the event there is a desire to exercise the contract option in cooperative contracts to purchase their transmission facilities, the Administration must include a specific request for funds to so do in its construction appropriation and that request must be specifically approved by the Congress before such purchase may be made.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate further on this subject, except for a few moments, to try to clear up some of the misunderstanding and fear and apprehension which may be in the minds of certain Senators. In the State of Oklahoma we have worked hard to bring about a proper distribution system, and to fulfill our obligations to see that the REA's in the Southwestern area, who have about a quarter of a billion dollars' worth of Government loans, have an opportunity to get the power supply to which the law has for so long said they were entitled.

We have had an uphill fight. First, it was most difficult to try to bring about a full utilization in our States of wheeling arrangements with the private power companies. Due to the very successful cooperation and support, I might add, of the Texas Power & Light Co., we managed to settle the question in Texas several years ago, and that has been a boon to set the pattern for proper cooperation with private utility companies in wheeling arrangements.

In the State of Oklahoma, those interested worked many years to effect wheeling arrangements. Unfortunately, the private utilities were not as cooperative in trying to work them out as were those in the State of Texas; but finally, with full knowledge and understanding of the negotiations with the REA generating and transmission cooperatives, the two big utilities in Oklahoma entered into what has been hailed as one of the greatest contracts which has ever been signed in the relationship between public power interests and private power interests. The private utilities knew what were the provisions of the contract. They knew also that the REA lines in the State of Oklahoma were destined to reach sections of Oklahoma which they themselves could not reach and render adequate service. Private power lines did not exist on which to wheel sufficient power to reach the sections which constituted a power desert. So they made no objection and did not delay signing the contract, because they knew what was in the picture.

I feel it is rather late, after contracts have been successfully negotiated with the private utilities and with the REA's, to come forward now with an amendment which literally stops this project. I fear it would leave the REA's of the State of Oklahoma and throughout the Southwest, except in the State of Texas, in a very bad state with respect to their electric supply.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In regard to the last point which the Senator made, were the people of his State given an opportunity to testify before the Appropriations Committee regarding the effect of this amendment?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad the Senator has brought that up. This amendment was not in the picture, as I understand, at the time the testimony was taken by the Senate Appropriation Subcommittee. I hope the chairman will correct me if I am in error, but as I understand, the subcommittee which was conducting the hearings did not report this amendment. It never considered the amendment. The amendment was put into the bill by the full Appropriations Committee, without hearings and without testimony.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wanted to be sure to emphasize that, because it illustrates the evil of changing basic legislation in an appropriation bill. That is the very reason for rule XVI, section 4, particularly the portion with regard to relevancy, being in the Rules and Manual of the United States Senate. It seems to be a very dangerous thing to do, and to be very unfair to the people of Oklahoma, or to others who may be involved, to come forward with an amendment which, in my opinion, is obviously not germane, an amendment which deals with a fundamental matter which no one who is affected has had an opportunity to consider or discuss, or to present testimony on the merits before the committees. It seems to me to be very bad practice.

I should like to observe, if the Senator from Oklahoma will permit that the idea of making the provision uniform with some provision applying to the Northwest, the great section of the Senator from Oregon, does not at all appeal to me, because the conditions are not uniform. That is absolutely a false analogy. If the rivers of the two sections were of the same character, if the dams in the Southwest were constructed in rivers such as the Columbia River, this question, which is of such great importance to the Senator from Oklahoma and to the people of the Southwest, would not have arisen.

I do not see how such an argument can be made in good faith. It is perfectly proper to have uniformity if it is possible, but the conditions are absolutely different.

Mr. MONRONEY. The conditions surrounding our problem are as different from those in Oregon and Bonneville as the Columbia River and other rivers in those great watersheds in the far West are different from ours.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator from Oklahoma will examine the Bonneville Act, he will see that the Bonneville Administration was given, as it should have been given, complete authority to oper-

ate that great and remarkable project on the Columbia River on a wise, sound, economic, and businesslike basis. It was given whatever discretion and flexibility were needed for that purpose. I read the act this morning. It was passed by the Seventy-fifth Congress. If there was anything left out of the act that should be in it, heaven knows, I could not see what it was. There was complete authority given to do the job.

As the Senator from Arkansas has suggested, there has not been any hearing on this question. It has not been even considered by the subcommittee. The amendment was offered after the hearings were closed. When the subcommittee reported the bill to the full committee there was inserted an amendment by the full committee to take from the Southwestern Power Administration the authority which it must have in order to operate on a wise and businesslike basis to meet its contracts and to provide benefits to the farmers and public bodies, which Congress, in the Flood Control Act of 1944, has promised and committed itself to provide.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to point out that because of the flexibility of the Bonneville Act, anticipating conditions which I know must be anticipated by the Senators from Oklahoma, we have gone ahead in the Pacific Northwest and are now 95.9 percent rural-electrified. Without this arrangement I do not think the State of Oklahoma can anticipate the kind of growth to which every State in the Union is entitled and will attain if power is available.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In regard to the question which disturbed the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], with respect to congressional approval and action, it seems to me the way in which this amendment is injected into the question is something less than congressional approval. It is more like a very clever device to evade any thorough consideration by the Congress of the proposal on its merits. When we examine the provision adopted by the House relating to an entirely different section of the country, the argument that it is germane certainly does not appeal to me at all. I think if the law is changed it should be changed as a result of a regular examination and hearing by the appropriate legislative committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida wishes to invite attention at this time to the fact that this specific matter was heard by the subcommittee, and that the record of the hearings, at pages 1609 to 1621, contains the testimony—

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the Senator be good enough to tell us who testified?

Mr. HOLLAND. I notice several names, such as Mr. Gesell.

Mr. MONRONEY. He is vice president of the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co.

Mr. HOLLAND. The question to which the Senator from Florida is addressing himself is that the matter was heard in public hearings by the subcommittee, and the testimony is set forth in some detail in that portion of the report which is headed "Use of the continuing fund," beginning on page 1609 and going to page 1621, further supplemented by a special showing that at the request of the committee a statement was later filed by one Frank M. Wilkes.

Mr. MONRONEY. He is the head of another utility company.

Mr. HOLLAND. That appears on pages 1941 to 1954, with numerous quotations from numerous other persons. The Senator from Florida did not attend the hearing, but he is sure that no one involved in this debate would want it to appear that there had been no consideration given to the subject.

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly do not want to leave that impression. After those representing the cooperatives had appeared, many weeks later two or three utility officers testified in behalf of killing the continuing fund. I did not want the Record to be erroneous on that point. But so far as the burden of proof is concerned, if this amendment is adopted, the result will be that the testimony of two or three witnesses will override the testimony of dozens of witnesses who must depend for an adequate power supply on the program which is under way in Oklahoma.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What I had in mind was that this amendment has no place in an appropriation bill at all. The Senate did not have the issue presented before a legislative committee, hearing witnesses having full knowledge of what was being considered, and having the issue fought out in that manner, primarily because I do not think the issue was properly before the committee. It is true that in the course of the hearings statements were made bearing upon legislation, but I do not think the amendment is properly in the bill, because there is nothing in the bill relating to the Southwestern Power Administration's continuing fund.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to address a question to the Senator from Arkansas. The matter was properly before the committee, and hearings were held on it. It came over from the House, so we had a right to deal with it as we are now dealing with it and as we always have a right to deal with a measure passed by the House. The legislative provision was originally attached to an appropriation bill by an amendment of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. The senior Senator from Oklahoma dwelt on that yesterday. There can be no question about it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida read rather carefully those portions of the record which were indexed under this particular point, beginning at page 1609 and going to about page 1621, and then beginning again at page 1941 and going through page 1954. It appeared to the Senator from Florida that the committee went into this subject matter from the point of view as to whether the interpretation by the Southwestern Power Administration was at all in accord with the legislative intent. A very strong showing was made, going back to the date of the hearings on the Rural Electrification Act itself, and quoting from the sponsors of that act, from appearances in the various hearings, and in arguments on the floor, quoting from statements made upon the floor at a later date. When this amendment was put in, a strong showing was made, and it seems to the Senator from Florida that the interpretation now being followed in the administration of the act by the Administrator thereof is at variance with what was intended.

That point was particularly studied by the committee, if the record correctly reflects what was done—and I am depending entirely upon the printed record, because I am not a member of the committee and did not attend the hearings—I feel that a strong showing was made before the committee that there were great departures from the intent of the legislation.

Mr. MONRONEY. But the subcommittee took no action with reference to this amendment. It was put into the bill by the full Appropriations Committee and not by the subcommittee which heard all the testimony.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Was the Senator about to yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. MONRONEY. I still have the floor, and I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me bring to the Senator's attention a statement in the report of the committee on the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1950, at page 4, which reads as follows:

With further reference to the Southwestern Power Administration, the committee recommends that the paragraph under the heading "Continuing fund, power transmission facilities" be deleted from the bill. This provision proposes to set up and maintain from receipts a continuing fund of \$300,000, including the sum of \$100,000 in the continuing fund established under the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944.

The said "continuing fund" was intended to be used for the "purchase of electric power and energy and rentals for the use of transmission lines and appurtenant facilities of public bodies, cooperatives, and privately-owned companies," and the committee reports that no law exists authorizing appropriations for such purposes.

Then follows the bill with the deletion recommended, and then follows, in the volume I hold in my hand, the amendment of the senior Senator from Okla-

homa creating the situation which we are now trying to rectify.

Mr. MONRONEY. Was not that in 1949?

Mr. McCARRAN. That was the appropriation bill for 1950.

Mr. MONRONEY. And the Senate did act in approving the amendment of the senior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. McCARRAN. It did, and it was legislation. No point was raised against it. We are now trying to rectify the situation. I do not want to take the Senator's time, because I intend to deal with the matter at some length. I would rather have the matter go to a vote and be through with it.

Let me say further that in effect it was said yesterday and today that this is a battle between private power lines and private power concerns, and public power. That is the farthest from being a part of the issue. The issue is: Shall the Congress of the United States assume a responsibility which under the Constitution belongs to the Congress? In other words, shall money, shall public funds, be appropriated out of the Treasury of the United States without consent of Congress? Let us consider the Treasury as we should. Let those who seek money for these purposes come to Congress for an appropriation. That is all there is involved in the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that it is absolutely necessary every year that the Southwestern Power Administrator come before the Appropriations Committee and lay in full view of the entire committee the complete operation with respect to the continuing fund, for its review and examination. Any time the members of the committee are critical or do not like what is presented to them, or it is found that the Southwestern Power Administration has abused its privilege, it is certainly within the power of the Appropriations Committee to withdraw the continuing fund.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me call the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma to the fact that under the language of the bill as it was amended, we can do nothing whatever with contracts which have already been made, with agreements which have already been entered into, to the extent that they are now negotiated, to the extent of some \$66,000,000 pledged from the Treasury of the United States for expenditure in the future. The Congress of the United States cannot touch that money.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Congress can touch it if it does not want to go along with the continuing fund.

Mr. McCARRAN. No, it cannot touch it, and in a couple of years it may reach the sum of \$166,000,000.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that every dollar the Southwestern Power Administrator collects is turned into the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. MONRONEY. It is.

Mr. KERR. And is available for appropriation by Congress, and for nothing

else, except that, with reference to the continuing fund, each month it can be kept at \$300,000?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I should like to make a brief observation, with the permission of my colleague, if I may receive unanimous consent that he will not thereby lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KERR. Our distinguished friend from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who is one of the ablest and finest Members of this body is, I believe, under the impression that the Administrator has the authority, under this continuing fund amendment, to take moneys received from the sale of power and spend it in maintaining and replacing and improving the transmission lines which are leased from the Western Electric Cooperative under the provisions of the contract which has been referred to. I should like to call my colleague's attention, as well as the attention of the distinguished Senator from Florida, to the fact that that is not the case; for the Administrator must come to the Congress of the United States, to the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of the Congress, and receive whatever money he is permitted to use for replacement of equipment, for improvement of equipment, or for anything else with reference to a transmission line, except money which it might be necessary to use in the case of an emergency to enable him to continue the flow of power, because of conditions which might arise by reason of storm or other act of God. Aside from that, every dollar he spends on improvement, repair, upkeep, maintenance or replacement of the transmission line must come to him by positive act of the Congress of the United States after he comes before it and submits his request and makes his presentation, and the committees of the two Houses have heard it and acted on it.

Mr. MONRONEY. And the continuing fund is continually reviewed every year the Administrator comes before the Appropriations Committees.

Mr. KERR. Yes; and it is put into the President's budget. I presume that is in the budget which is before the Congress now. It is referred to the committees of both Houses, and the Administrator undergoes rigid cross-examination when he lays the subject matter on the table. In a few moments I expect to have a delineation of every dollar he has received and every dollar he has spent, and what has been done about the matter since this amendment became the law. I shall place that delineation in the Record in a few moments.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I note that in the debate of yesterday, as found on page 7979 of the Record, the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma, in response to

a question from the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], made a statement, part of which I shall read, and all of which is available if the Senator wishes it to be inserted in the RECORD.

He said:

The money can be spent only for the purchase of power or for the lease or rental of facilities. It would not be turned over more than once a month, at the most.

My question to the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma is this. Is it the meaning of the statement which he made yesterday in the debate that the turning over of the entire \$300,000 may be accomplished as often as the business of the Southwestern Power Administration requires, but that his judgment is that it would not be more than once a month? Is that the meaning of that statement?

Mr. MONRONEY. No. The question was asked what the maximum possible turnover might ultimately be. Obviously, if the Southwestern Power Administration reaches its goal in the matter of the large number of preferred customers it seeks to serve, it is going to have large bills for firm steam power with both the REA's and with the private utilities. The service charge for wheeling over these private power lines runs a mill and a half, I believe, or a mill and a fourth. The more business that is done, the more power that is sold, the more turn-over there is going to be in the continuing fund. By the same token, a greater number of dollars are going to be brought into the Treasury as the result. That purchase of power is for the use of the private-power lines for service, or even for the use of the REA transmission lines for service. The more power that is run over them, the more they are used, the more money is going to be earned for the Government. Does that explain to the Senator how the operation works?

Mr. HOLLAND. No; not entirely. Did the Senator mean by his statement yesterday, which I have already quoted from the RECORD, to say that, if required by the size of the operation, the entire revolving fund of \$300,000 might be turned over once monthly?

Mr. MONRONEY. It could be turned over once monthly if the volume of business warranted the purchase of power, the wheeling of power over private lines, or the purchase of other power from the REA's, or even from other sources.

Mr. HOLLAND. The next question is this: Would it not be true that under such conditions this provision of the law, as now administered, would permit the expenditure by the Southwestern Power Administration as much as \$3,600,000 a year without appropriation by the Congress?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct; because it is a month-to-month, daily business operation, involving power which is being sold, to settle the balances which are due. Any time this fund is improperly used and any time the Appropriations Committee finds that it is not being used for the purpose specified, it can certainly call the Administrator to task and change or further restrict the use of that fund.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is called from the Chamber by circumstances beyond his control. I wonder if his friend [Mr. MONRONEY] will yield for the purpose of his making a brief statement, which will not require more than 2 or 3 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, some reference has been made to the attitude of those who take the position which the Senator from Florida is constrained to take in this matter. So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, consistently throughout all the years since its creation he has been a strong supporter of the REA. As a member of the senate of the State of Florida, he served as floor leader in connection with the act—which was hotly contested—under which the organization of associations in the State of Florida was permitted, in order to operate under the conditions of the REA Act.

Since coming to the Senate he has on many occasions assisted in setting up or enlarging REA activities, and that will always be his position. He supported the Johnsonville steam plant for TVA. He supported the Andalusia steam plant in the State of his good friend the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the later substitute for that plant. He has supported, in the case of a group of Florida cooperatives, a strong request for a Florida steam plant known as the Seminole plant, which was found not to be necessary by reason of the concessions later made by the power company. He expects to continue strongly to support this program, but he feels very sincerely—and that is the sole purpose of this statement—that this program could easily get entirely out of hand and become subject to misinterpretation and enlargement by the fiat of administrative regulation and interpretation in the field, in such a way as to take away from Congress its own jurisdiction and responsibilities, not only to the prejudice of Congress and all the people of the United States, but possibly—and the Senator from Florida makes no charge that that is the case in this instance—to the very great injury of members of cooperatives served either by the Southwestern Power Administration or by other Federal agencies in the field.

For that reason the Senator from Florida very strongly feels that the Congress should preserve its own jurisdiction, and that the soundness of this whole program and the degree of confidence in which it is held by the people generally, will be greatly shaken if the idea ever becomes established that administrators in the field can interpret the law in any way they see fit and commit the United States to the making of investments running into many millions of dollars in the purchase of transmission lines or power facilities, without the Congress having devolved upon it the necessity of determining the propriety of the building or acquisition of the particular facilities.

Because the Senator from Florida prizes this program and believes that it

has been full of tremendous good for the rural population of the Nation, he wants to keep it, like Caesar's wife, above suspicion. He feels that in just such mistaken friendship, in just such mistaken liberality in the treatment of officials in the field, lies the greatest possibility of destroying the confidence of the people as a whole in this very fine program. For that reason he will certainly insist upon Congress preserving its responsibility, as he feels it should.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President—

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I hope the Senator from Oklahoma will not let the statement of the Senator from Florida go unanswered. The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it requires iteration, reiteration, and sometimes additional reiteration; but certainly it has been said time and again by the junior Senator from Oklahoma and the senior Senator from Oklahoma, as well as by the Senator from Alabama, that the Southwestern Power Administration cannot buy lines. It cannot build steam plants. It cannot build reservoirs, or anything of that kind, without coming to Congress and getting express authority for it. In fact, so far as a steam plant is concerned, it has no authority whatever.

Mr. MONRONEY. It cannot set foot in a steam plant.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator from Oklahoma has said, the only thing the continuing fund can be used for is to meet an emergency such as a terrible flood or storm, or something of that kind, which blows down power lines or impairs or destroys portions of the power facilities. It can be used to carry out a wheeling agreement, to lease a transmission line, or to buy power from a private power company or from an REA, to firm up otherwise secondary or dump power, which would be sold at a give-away price, so to speak.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Possibly the Senator from Alabama has implied the answer to the question I was about to ask the Senator from Oklahoma. However, I should like to ask the question and let the Senator from Oklahoma answer it in his own way.

I should like to ask a question with respect to a statement which is found on page 7977 of the RECORD of yesterday. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] quoted a statement which was made by Representative Whittington before the House Appropriations Committee in connection with the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1947. As the Senator from Oklahoma knows, Mr. Whittington was chairman of the Committee on Flood Control in the House of Representatives, which had a large part to play in writing the Flood Control Act of 1944, including the paragraph which

relates to disposal of power. Mr. Whittington is quoted as having said before the committee:

I thought it was unwise, and it was not our intention, to give the Secretary of the Interior power to construct transmission lines and other related facilities from the income of the power sale, but to require him to come to Congress for the funds for the construction of transmission lines and other of the facilities.

It may be that the Senator from Alabama stated that the money, which would be available for the replenishment of the \$300,000 fund, would not be available for the construction of transmission lines; but is that not a part of the whole proposal before us? Does not the use of the revolving fund to purchase power under contract from associations of cooperatives, when the contract provides for the ultimate transfer of such lines to the Department of the Interior, indirectly provide for the acquisition of transmission lines from the proceeds of power sales?

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly cannot see that it does, because the cooperatives were organized long before Mr. Wright came to the State of Oklahoma as Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration. These plans were in the mill long before that. In trying to develop an integrated system of rural cooperative supply the Southwestern Power Administration did step into the picture, and has integrated the REA cooperatives. In that way they will receive the benefit of the hydroelectric power, and they will maintain their own steam plants. But by having contracts with Mr. Wright's organization, the Southwestern Power Administration, they can operate them for 20 hours a day, or 24 hours a day, instead of 12 or 14 hours a day. They can make a much better showing of low-cost generation than they possibly could without contracts for the sale of the power, and without contracts for the use of their lines.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Then, is the Senator from Oklahoma in harmony with the interpretation of the intent of the law as stated by Mr. Whittington, that the Secretary of the Interior should come to Congress for the funds for construction of transmission lines?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Secretary does come to Congress now. There is some money provided in this bill for that purpose. The money has been provided for that purpose in other bills. The Secretary must come to Congress to get the money to build the lines. But that is not true with respect to the REA's. In the law which Congress enacted 2 years ago we specifically gave the Secretary the right not only to buy steam-generated power, but to lease lines and facilities. The Senate passed it, and it became a part of the law.

Mr. CASE. Can the Senator from Oklahoma state, if he knows, whether a contract between the Southwestern Power Administration and the western cooperatives provides for the ultimate

transfer to the Southwestern Power Administration of transmission lines?

Mr. MONRONEY. It provides that the Government has an option under which it can buy them, if Congress approves at any time during the lease contract. The Southwestern Power Administration cannot acquire and they cannot buy any lines they lease unless and until Congress specifically acts to authorize them to do it.

Mr. CASE. Do they acquire any rights in connection with the payment of sums of money out of the \$300,000 fund to acquire electric energy?

Mr. MONRONEY. No. Does the Senator have reference to generating plants?

Mr. CASE. I have reference to acquisition.

Mr. MONRONEY. No; because the plants are solely in the hands of the REA. Much has been said about vast amounts of power. It should be borne in mind that the total capacity is 115,000 kilowatts. That is the total amount involved in the contracts. There are seven REA generating and transmission cooperatives, and only four of the seven generate power.

One generates 30,000 kilowatts, another generates 15,000 kilowatts, another generates 40,000 kilowatts, and the Western Electric cooperative generates 30,000 kilowatts, a total of 115,000 kilowatts. The Western Electric cooperative is today putting in a 150,000 kilowatt plant. We are not talking about big figures.

It should also be borne in mind that the Southwestern Power Administration, because of its contracts with the cooperatives, within 4 years, after the construction has been seasoned and the load built up, will sell them about twice as much power as they buy from it now.

Actually, the load which will be furnished by the cooperatives is a very small proportion, but their plants are well placed with respect to where the need exists, particularly in Missouri and other places, where there is a real need for power.

Mr. CASE. Any expenditure for development from the \$300,000 continuing fund would be solely for the purchase of current, if the Senator understands me, not for acquisition or any right of acquisition?

Mr. MONRONEY. There is no right of acquisition whatsoever so far as steam plants are concerned. The right to an option to purchase the lines is provided, if Congress should give its consent.

I should like to say one more thing in conclusion, and then I shall yield the floor to the chairman of the subcommittee. If we pull the rug from under this whole operation of wheeling contracts with private utilities, and contracts with REA's, into which they have entered in good faith, and not provide anything in the bill to take its place, we will be in a state of confusion, and without any funds and without any method of operating. The pending amendment, which was hurriedly put into the bill at the last meeting of the Committee on Appropriations, would certainly destroy the

chances of our farmers, to which they have looked forward for so long, to have a low-cost and a dependable source of power.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The farmers in the Senator's State would have no money with which to pay private power companies with which the Administration has signed such contract, because they would not carry power free and could not be expected to carry power free.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yet the policy of Congress, as set forth in the bill, is to try to encourage the signing of new contracts with private utilities. How will it be possible to do so? There would be no authority granted to the Secretary of the Interior to enter into any contracts.

Mr. HILL. No funds would be provided with which to pay for the services?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. I hope the Senator will emphasize in one word how much it is to the interest of the Government and to the taxpayers, who have to put up the money to pay for the flood-control dams, to be able to buy the private power in order to firm up the secondary or dump power. The Government can get much more for the power, if it is firmed up by purchasing power from the private utilities or cooperatives and selling it as firm power, than it would be possible to get if the Government were forced to sell the power as dump power.

Mr. MONRONEY. The difference is the difference between 1½ mills and 5.6 mills.

Mr. HILL. About four times as much?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; if we dump the power without making it available to the people who are ready and willing to use it, someone else will deliver it to them, and the people will have to pay 5.6 mills, 7 mills, or even 8 mills. Therefore, it is to the benefit of the Government, as well as the people, to maintain the arrangement.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I make a point of order that the proviso of the committee amendment, beginning with the word "Provided" in line 24 on page 3, down to and including the word "facilities", in line 22 on page 4 is legislation on an appropriation bill, and, therefore, is not in order.

Under the heading "Continuing fund" the words beginning in line 6, at page 4, down to and including the word "facilities", in line 22 on page 4, are a repetition of the language of the existing law. However, there are omitted from the existing law—and that is how it becomes legislation—the words:

And to cover all costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy and rental for the use of facilities for the transmission and distribution of electric power and energy to public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies.

I therefore make the point of order that the amendment proposes legislation on an appropriation bill and is not in order under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The Chair wishes to confer with the Parliamentarian.

Mr. CASE. While the Chair is conferring with the Parliamentarian, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. CASE. In other words, the point made by the Senator from Arizona is that since the amendment omits a portion of the existing law it is an amendment of the existing law.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the position taken by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is correct, namely, that the amendment is general legislation, and therefore is not in order on that ground.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand that the Senator from Nevada desires to make a point of order that, notwithstanding the point of order which I have made, the amendment may be germane to language already in the bill. At his request, therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before a quorum call is had, may I inquire as to the reasoning of the distinguished Senator from Arizona on his point of order? As I understand, he makes the point of order on the ground that a portion of the language in the so-called McCarran amendment changes existing law.

Mr. HAYDEN. It does.

Mr. WHERRY. Which existing law was passed prior to this session of Congress?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. On that basis the Senator feels that his point of order should be sustained?

Mr. HAYDEN. The point of order has been sustained by the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from Arizona restate what he said a moment ago with reference to the position of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], as I understand, contends that because there is in the bill a legislative provision, adopted by the House, relating to the Southeastern Power Administration, the subject matter of which is a continuing fund, it would be in order and germane to amend the language and change the law relating to the Southwestern Power Administration.

As I pointed out the other day, my judgment is that they are two separate substantive propositions. The question of germaneness must be passed upon by the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. May I ask the distinguished occupant of the chair whether he made his ruling with the full knowledge of the statement now made by the Senator from Arizona relative to the observations of the Senator from Nevada, that there is in the bill language relating to the Southeastern Power Administration which is now sought to be applied to the Southwestern Power Administration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The Chair had no alternative; he was placed in a position in which he could make no other ruling.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, that point had come to the knowledge of the distinguished occupant of the chair when he made the ruling.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hendrickson	McKellar
Benton	Hennings	Millikin
Bricker	Hill	Monroney
Bridges	Hoey	Moody
Butler, Md.	Holland	Morse
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Mundt
Cain	Hunt	Neely
Capehart	Ives	Nixon
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	O'Connor
Case	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Clements	Kem	Robertson
Connally	Kerr	Russell
Cordon	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Lehman	Stennis
Eastland	Lodge	Taft
Eaton	Long	Underwood
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Welker
Flanders	McCarran	Wherry
Frear	McCarthy	Williams
Fulbright	McClellan	Young
Hayden	McFarland	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I fear that inadvertently a mistake has been made, and I desire to correct it. When this matter was discussed in committee, I had understood that it was merely a question of whether the language proposed by the committee amendment was germane to the provision which the House placed in the bill with respect to the Southeastern Power Administration. I inquired of the Parliamentarian as to how to proceed. His directive was to make the point of order that it was legislation on an appropriation bill; which I did. It seems, now, that when I made the point of order, the next move should have been, before the Chair ruled, for the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to say, "Yes, but it is germane to the provision which the House incorporated in the bill." That is a question, not debatable, to be passed upon by the Senate. Not realizing that the Senator from Nevada had to be present and on his feet at that instant, to take that action, I hope the Chair will rescind his ruling, and that we may start all over again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the circumstances, the Chair believes he would be justified in rescinding his previous ruling and in view of the understanding which was had, in giving the opportunity to the Senator from Nevada, to make his motion now.

Mr. HAYDEN. I renew the point of order, that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona withhold making the point of order so that I may submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HAYDEN. What is the request?

Mr. KERR. I had intended to place in the RECORD a brief statement with reference to certain facts, which statement is still in the process of preparation by the office of the Secretary of the Interior,

I had underestimated the brevity of the Senate, and therefore thought I would have plenty of time. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to place the statement in the RECORD at this point, prior to the making of the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement, in a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, is as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., July 10, 1951.

MY DEAR SENATOR KERR: In response to your telephone request, I am happy to supply you with information as to the revenues, and the continuing fund available to Southwestern Power Administration. From fiscal year 1944 through fiscal year 1949 the continuing fund available to SPA amounted to \$100,000. In the appropriation act for fiscal year 1950 this fund was increased to \$300,000. During this entire period the total expenditures from the fund have amounted to \$78,165. That amount was expended in fiscal year 1949 in order to insure continuity of service. No money has as yet been expended from this fund for the purchase of power or costs in connection with the leases of transmission facilities.

The following table shows the actual and estimated figures by years from 1949 to 1953, inclusive, for gross revenues and expenditures from the continuing fund:

Fiscal year	Revenue	Continuing fund expenditures
1949.....	\$1,540,089	\$78,765
1950.....	1,627,867	0
1951 (estimated).....	2,280,000	0
1952 (estimated).....	2,383,000	198,000
1953 (estimated).....	6,700,000	2,800,000

You will note that we expect to receive a total revenue of \$2,230,000 in the current fiscal year without the use of the continuing fund. It is anticipated that in fiscal year 1952 the continuing fund will have to provide \$198,000 for the purchase of power and service charges under the Oklahoma contract with private utilities. In fiscal year 1953 the continuing fund will have to supply a total of \$2,800,000 for the purchase of power and service charges under the Oklahoma contract and the purchase of power and lease of facilities under the contracts with generation and transmission cooperatives. By that time the gross sales by Southwestern Power Administration will have increased to \$6,700,000.

You will note from these few statistics how important the continuing fund is to the successful operation of the Oklahoma contract which was executed by this Department last year and which became effective after confirmation and approval of the rate schedules therein in February of this year. If these wheeling type contracts in which the Congress has expressed such great interest are to be successful, the continuing fund for SPA must remain in force and effect as it is written in the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1950.

All revenues since the initial service from the Norfolk and Denison project in 1944 have been deposited in miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury except the \$300,000 which is now in the continuing fund. All except this amount are subject to appropriation by Congress.

Regarding your further inquiry as to the contract said to have been executed on August 4, 1949 with Western Electric Cooperative, Inc., records show that a contract was executed with that organization on January 3, 1949, and one on lease of lines on March 24, 1950, but do not show any on the

date stated. Our authority for these two contracts was, for the first, our basic law, and for the second the Kerr amendment, which was enacted several months earlier.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to state that the point of order has already been made. The Chair simply rescinded his ruling. The point of order was not withdrawn. The Chair now recognizes the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, conceding that it is legislation, the amendment is germane, and I therefore make the point of order that it is germane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, under the Senate rules, now submits to the Senate the question raised by the Senator from Nevada, namely, Is the amendment germane or relevant to the subject matter of the House bill? The Chair understands that the question is not debatable. The Chair wishes to confer with the Parliamentarian.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. KERR. Is the question of germaneness automatically subject to a yea-and-nay vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is not debatable. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that there is no mandatory provision for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. KERR. I ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE. Under the rule, may an amendment be considered, if it is held to be legislation? Would it not automatically fall from the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that such is not the case. The Chair asked the same question of the Parliamentarian a few moments ago. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair, now, that if the amendment is held to be germane, then it will be open to further amendment.

Mr. CASE. It is in order, notwithstanding the fact that it is legislation. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The previous occupant of the chair has advised the Chair that the ruling on the point of order was rescinded by the occupant of the chair, and that the yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Butler, Nebr.	Chavez
Benton	Cain	Clements
Bricker	Capehart	Connally
Bridges	Carlson	Cordon
Butler, Md.	Case	Dirksen

Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Mundt
Dworshak	Kem	Neely
Eastland	Kerr	Nixon
Ecton	Kilgore	O'Connor
Ellender	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Ferguson	Langer	Pastore
Flanders	Lehman	Robertson
Frear	Lodge	Russell
Fulbright	Long	Schoeppel
Hayden	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Hendrickson	Malone	Smith, N. C.
Hennings	McCarran	Stennis
Hill	McCarthy	Taft
Hoey	McClellan	Underwood
Holland	McFarland	Watkins
Humphrey	McKellar	Welker
Hunt	Millikin	Wherry
Ives	Monroney	Williams
Johnson, Colo.	Moody	Young
Johnson, Tex.	Morse	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

During the absence of the present Presiding Officer a point of order was raised against the pending amendment on the ground that it was general legislation on an appropriation bill. The temporary occupant of the chair sustained the point of order, which decision he later rescinded, because, under the rules, although an amendment which is legislation on an appropriation bill may therefore be out of order, if it is germane to some legislative provision in the bill itself, the question of its germaneness must be passed on by the Senate, without debate. That is now the question before the Senate, Is the pending amendment germane?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll. Senators who think the amendment is germane will vote "yea"; those who think it is not germane will vote "nay."

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If he were present he would vote "yea"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. STENNIS (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If he were present he would vote "yea"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent because of illness.

I announce that on this vote the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] has a general pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations has a general pair on this vote with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and that pair has been announced previously.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation.

On this vote the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] who is detained on official business is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—42

Bricker	Flanders	McKellar
Bridges	Hendrickson	Millikin
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Mundt
Cain	Holland	Nixon
Capehart	Ives	O'Connor
Carlson	Kem	Robertson
Case	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Lodge	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Long	Taft
Eastland	Malone	Watkins
Ecton	McCarran	Welker
Ellender	McCarthy	Wherry
Ferguson	McClellan	Williams

NAYS—30

Aiken	Hill	McFarland
Benton	Humphrey	Monroney
Chavez	Hunt	Moody
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Frear	Kerr	Pastore
Fulbright	Langer	Russell
Hayden	Lehman	Underwood
Hennings	Magnuson	Young

NOT VOTING—24

Anderson	Green	Saltonstall
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Smathers
Brewster	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Butler, Nebr.	Kefauver	Sparkman
Byrd	Martin	Stennis
Duff	Maybank	Thye
George	McMahon	Tobey
Gillette	Murray	Wiley

So the Senate decided that the amendment was germane.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning in line 24, on page 3, to and including line 22 on page 4.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE RELATING TO PROCEDURE IN CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the leaders on both sides, and of the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. There is on the calendar a joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 82, Calendar 475, to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to add thereto a chapter relating to procedure in condemnation proceedings. That measure was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary. Under the law as it now stands the Judicial Conference of the Federal courts submits to the Congress on or before a certain date each year any change it may propose in the rules of the Federal courts. Unless the joint resolution dealing with the change of rules submitted to us by the Chief Justice, who, as chairman of the Judicial Conference, submits the proposed changes in the rules, is acted upon by the Congress before the end of July, and the proposed change is either modified or altered, it becomes the rule of the court. The joint resolution is now on the calendar. I fear that something may arise by reason of which the Senate will be deprived of the right to vote on this very important change in the rules.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that Senate Joint Resolution 82 be taken up for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if, in case the joint resolution is not passed, the proposed rule would not change the procedure so that in condemnation proceedings owners of property would be deprived of the right of trial by jury?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, that is exactly the matter that was presented to the Congress. It has been considered by the Committee on the Judiciary and the measure is now on the Senate calendar.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, I should like to state that we discussed this matter in the policy committee of the majority. We decided that it was an important subject, and I hope there will be no objection to consideration and passage of the joint resolution immediately. If there is one thing that is important to our country, it is that the right of trial by jury be preserved. Even though we have now before us for consideration an important appropriation bill, I am of the opinion that it should be temporarily laid aside and that we should proceed to consider the joint resolution, so as to preserve the right of trial by jury in condemnation cases.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 82) to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to add thereto a chapter relating to procedure in condemnation proceedings.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada that the appropriation bill, which is the unfinished business, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider the joint resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection if the distinguished Senator from Nevada will amend his unanimous-consent request so that the joint resolution be made the order of business for 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. It is now after 5 o'clock. It seems to me that, as soon as possible, we should proceed to vote on the committee amendment to the appropriation bill, which was being considered when the Senator from Nevada made his request.

I think each and every Senator ought to have the time from now until noon tomorrow to look into the joint resolution referred to by the Senator from Nevada. Personally, I wish to commend the Senator from Nevada for endeavoring to have it considered by the Senate. But I believe that between now and tomorrow noon Members of the Senate should be given an opportunity to read and study the joint resolution, even though it may be simple in its terms. I shall not object if it is made the special order of business of the Senate for tomorrow noon.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have no objection to that. I simply thought that because of the fact that there are now so many Members present on the floor we would be justified in having immediate consideration of the joint resolution. I should like to have as many Members as possible on the Senate floor when the joint resolution is considered, because it is a highly important matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada amend his request?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest that there are quite a number of Members of the Senate present now on the floor. The subject matter of the joint resolution could be discussed with the understanding that it would then go over until tomorrow, when there could be

a limitation of debate of 30 minutes, if that would be agreeable to the Members of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection so far as I am personally concerned. I believe the Members of the minority in the Senate will agree with me that we can make the joint resolution the pending business now, and, if Senators desire, discuss it now, but that when the Senate convenes tomorrow, 1 hour be allotted for discussion of the joint resolution 30 minutes to each side, and then that a vote be taken on it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada modify his request in the manner suggested?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am glad to modify my request. The only reason I wished to have the joint resolution taken up at this time was that we now have a splendid attendance on the floor, and I should like to make an explanation of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think it is very important that we proceed with the consideration of the proposed change in the rules of Federal court procedure tomorrow at noon. I think it is of fundamental importance that we preserve the jury system in passing upon exactly such questions as condemnation proceedings. I think it would be a great mistake to limit debate on a principle so fundamental as that. Therefore, while I have no objection to considering the joint resolution at noon tomorrow, I do object to any limitation of debate on the issue.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The objection goes to the whole request.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Nevada modify his request, so as to provide that the joint resolution be made the order of business tomorrow at noon?

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well. Would it be agreeable to explain the joint resolution now, which would probably take 7 or 8 minutes? Then Senators will have my explanation to consider overnight.

The VICE PRESIDENT. First, is there objection to making Senate Joint Resolution 82 the pending business beginning at 12 o'clock tomorrow? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senator from Nevada may proceed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is an original joint resolution intended to establish a uniform system of procedure in the trial of condemnation proceedings.

By the Rules Act of 1934, the Supreme Court was given authority to promulgate uniform rules of civil procedure which should have the force and effect of law. Originally, the Supreme Court was required to make its report through the Attorney General at the beginning of a session, and the rules so adopted and reported by the Supreme Court were to become effective only upon the expiration of one full session of the Congress. An amendment to the Rules Act in the Eighty-first Congress provided that the

promulgated rule might be reported directly to the Congress on or before May 1 of any year, and that the rule would then become effective 90 days after its submission to the Congress.

On the 1st day of May, 1951, the Supreme Court submitted to the Congress a rule designated as rule 71A, to govern proceedings in condemnation cases. This rule will therefore become effective August 1 unless the Congress by statute provides otherwise in advance of that date.

A study of this rule indicated to the committee that while the rule as a whole is meritorious, one feature of it is objectionable. This feature is found in section (h) of the rule, which in effect gives the court in condemnation proceedings the authority to determine whether or not a jury should be used in such cases. The committee is of the opinion that such broad delegation of authority over trial by jury should not be permitted. At the present time, in 41 States, a litigant may have a jury trial of the issue of reasonable compensation, in a condemnation case. This new rule promulgated by the Supreme Court would take away that right and permit a Federal court in its discretion to have the issue of just compensation determined by a commission appointed by the court. This is the provision which, the committee has voted unanimously, should be rejected.

The committee, however, desired to carry out the intention of the Supreme Court insofar as it was compatible with the views of the Congress. The committee was informed and believes that Congress lacks power to disapprove the new rule in part, but should disapprove it completely, or not at all. The committee has therefore reported this original joint resolution which disapproves the rule as promulgated by the Supreme Court in toto; but in this same joint resolution the committee proposes to enact all of the rule as promulgated by the Supreme Court except that portion of section (h) which was deemed to be objectionable.

Section (h) as it now appears in Senate Joint Resolution 82 conforms with the views of the Advisory Committee to the Supreme Court, as expressed at its meeting in 1948, and conforms also with the expressed position of the Department of Justice, as set forth in the supplemental report of the Advisory Committee to the Supreme Court in House Document 121, Eighty-second Congress.

The Judiciary Committee is of the opinion that there should be a uniform Federal rule of procedure relative to condemnation cases, and believes that the procedure set forth in Senate Joint Resolution 82 which provides for trial before a jury, if demanded by either party, or before the court, is a good and satisfactory rule. The committee therefore recommends that the joint resolution be considered favorably.

It should be stressed that this rule, as promulgated by the Supreme Court, will become effective August 1 unless both Houses of Congress and the President take action prior to that date to approve legislation specifically directing that the

rule shall not become effective. If Congress should approve such a resolution in its simplest form, the Supreme Court would be unable to promulgate an amended rule for submission to Congress until next year, since such a rule may not be submitted after May 1 of any year. That is why the committee has brought out a resolution which not only in terms rejects the whole rule as issued by the Supreme Court but which also would enact all of the rule except the one portion which has been found objectionable, namely, the portion eliminating the right to a jury trial of the issue of just compensation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Am I to understand that the rule as promulgated will go into effect unless the Congress acts?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And that the rule, as promulgated, would leave it to the discretion of the trial court as to whether or not a jury should pass on the issue of compensation?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In effect, that amounts to the denial of a jury trial.

Mr. McCARRAN. It could amount to that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would amount to it if the court exercised that discretion.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand, it is proposed to enact, by a joint resolution, all of the rule which is not objectionable. As I understand, this is the only part of the rule which is objectionable.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The joint resolution would compel the court to grant a jury trial if either party demanded it.

Mr. McCARRAN. The joint resolution would leave the situation as it is. At the present time either party may demand a jury trial.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Either party now may demand a jury trial.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And the court has no jurisdiction in the matter, but is compelled to grant the request.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Michigan will withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum so that I may ask the Senator from Nevada a couple of questions in connection with his explanation.

Mr. FERGUSON. I withhold it for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Can the Senator from Nevada advise the Senate whether up to this time any other rule has been promulgated by the Supreme Court which sought to grant discretion to a trial

judge to waive a jury in the trial of any issue before the court?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have none in mind at this time. I do not think there has been. I am quite certain there has not been ever since I have been on the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in my understanding that in the opinion of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary this would create the first precedent by which a rule would be promulgated giving a trial court discretion to waive a jury trial?

Mr. McCARRAN. Of which I have any knowledge.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Nevada agree with me that the establishment of such a precedent should be more carefully scrutinized by this body, because it might be the beginning of the undermining of the whole jury system in American jurisprudence, which some forces in this country would seem to like to undermine?

Mr. McCARRAN. That was exactly the thought which impelled the Judiciary Committee unanimously to report the joint resolution to the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Perhaps it is an antiquated document, and perhaps few people ever refer to it, but I wish to read amendment VII to the Constitution of the United States for general information:

In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed \$20, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by jury, shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

Mr. President, to my mind, such a rule would be an absolute violation of that provision of the Constitution. All of us held up our hands to Almighty God and swore that we would protect and defend the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield for that purpose?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. What is the pending question? Is it not the vote on the McCarran amendment, which has been declared to be germane?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. I have asked unanimous consent that I may make a 4- or 5-minute explanation, so that the explanation could be before the Members of the Senate overnight and could be considered tomorrow when a vote would be taken on the joint resolution.

Mr. FERGUSON. I withdraw my request for a quorum call, in view of the fact that I now know what the pending question is. I believe we should vote on the McCarran amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No suggestion of the absence of a quorum is before the Senate, because the Senator from Nevada had the floor and he had not yielded to the Senator from Michigan for that purpose.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I yield the floor, because the Senate has agreed to do what I requested.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning in line 24 at page 3 of the bill.

Several Senators requested the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the negative when his name was called.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Chair state whether the Senate is voting on the amendment to the committee amendment or on the committee amendment itself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There was no amendment to the committee amendment. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma was an amendment to the bill. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. STENNIS (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent because of illness.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] has a general pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations has a general pair on this vote with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and that pair has been announced previously.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation.

On this vote the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—39

Bricker	Ferguson	McCarthy
Bridges	Flanders	McClellan
Butler, Md.	Hendrickson	McKellar
Cain	Hoey	Millikin
Capehart	Holland	Nixon
Carlson	Ives	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kern	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Knowland	Taft
Dworshak	Lodge	Watkins
Eastland	Long	Welker
Eaton	Malone	Wherry
Ellender	McCarran	Williams

NAYS—29

Aiken	Hayden	Kerr
Case	Hennings	Langer
Chavez	Hill	Lehman
Clements	Humphrey	Magnuson
Connally	Hunt	McFarland
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Monroney
Fulbright	Johnson, Tex.	Moody

Morse
Mundt
Neely

O'Mahoney
Pastore
Russell

Underwood
Young

NOT VOTING—28

Anderson
Bennett
Benton
Brewster
Butler, Nebr.
Byrd
Frear
George
Gillette
Green

Hickenlooper
Jenner
Johnson, S. C.
Kefauver
Martin
Maybank
McMahon
Murray
O'Connor
Robertson

Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith, N. J.
Sparkman
Stennis
Tobey
Wiley

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I wish to place a matter in the RECORD.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to my colleague for that purpose.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the amendment on which the Senate has just voted concludes all reference in the bill to the Southeastern Power Administration. On yesterday a request was made to have included in the RECORD a copy of the negotiated contract between the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, at Langley Field, and the Virginia Electric & Power Co. I have a copy of the contract, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the contract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEGOTIATED ELECTRIC SERVICE CONTRACT No. NAW-6078 DATED APRIL 30, 1951, BETWEEN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS, LANGLEY FIELD, VA.) AND VIRGINIA ELECTRIC & POWER CO.

Premises to be served: Langley Field, Va. County: Elizabeth City. State: Virginia.

Contractor: Virginia Electric & Power Co., Richmond, Va.

Premises are Government owned.

Connection charge: None.

Bills will be rendered to officer in charge of this contract at National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Payments will be made by United States regional disbursing officer at Richmond, Va.

This negotiated contract is made pursuant to the provisions of section 2 (c) (10) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (Public Law 413, 80th Cong.).

THE NACA NEGOTIATED ELECTRIC SERVICE CONTRACT

This contract, entered into as of April 30, 1951, by and between the United States of America, hereinafter called the Government, represented by the contracting officer executing this contract, and the Virginia Electric & Power Co., whose address is Richmond, Va., hereinafter called the contractor, witnesseth that the parties hereto do mutually agree as follows:

1. SCOPE AND TERM OF CONTRACT

(a) Subject to the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth, the Contractor shall sell and deliver to the Government and the Government shall purchase and receive from the Contractor electric service (hereinafter called service) requested by the Government from the Contractor at the premises to be served hereunder (hereinafter called the service location), all in accordance with electric service specifications attached hereto and made a part hereof.

(b) (i) Except as provided in paragraph 1, (b) (iii) hereof, the date of initial delivery hereunder shall be the date upon which contractor completes the installation

of facilities described in paragraphs 5 and 10 of Electric Service Specifications attached hereto and is prepared to deliver 70,000 kilowatts on-peak and 150,000 kilowatts off-peak to Government at Langley Field and Government is prepared to take delivery of these amounts of service. The parties hereto will make every reasonable effort to be prepared to deliver and to take delivery of these amounts of service on or before January 1, 1953, however, in no event shall the effective date hereof be more than 6 months after January 1, 1953, or more than 6 months after the date on which contractor is prepared to deliver the above amounts of service whichever is later.

(ii) The term of this contract will be for the remaining portion of the Government's fiscal year and will be renewed for a period of 10 years, subject to the appropriation of necessary funds. The contract will be renewed yearly thereafter until and unless terminated by the Government giving not less than 60 days' written notice of termination. However, in order that Government may receive any benefits that might accrue from the purchase of its service requirements from Buggs Island project, Government, at any time during the term of this contract, may cease obtaining its service requirements from contractor provided Government obtains its service requirements for Langley Field from Southeastern Power Administration by wheeling power from the Buggs Island project through contractor's facilities, including those provided hereunder, under the terms of any agreement which contractor may make with Southeastern Power Administration for wheeling such power.

(iii) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this contract and exhibits, upon completion of the second transmission line from contractor's Chesterfield station to Langley Field, which is expected to be completed in January or February of 1952, contractor will make available to Government hereunder 50,000 kilowatts at unity power factor during the on-peak hours and 75,000 kilowatts at unity power factor during the off-peak hours. In the event Government elects to take delivery of service hereunder after this second transmission line between contractor's Chesterfield station and Langley Field is completed the charges will be based on a contract demand of 50,000 kilowatts until the delivery and receipt of service commences under paragraph 1 (b) (1) hereof.

(c) (i) For and in consideration of the faithful performance of the stipulations of this contract, the contractor shall be paid by the designated disbursing office or officer for service herein contracted for, at the rates and under the terms and conditions herein set forth; provided, that the Government shall be liable for the minimum monthly charge specified in this contract commencing with the billing period in which service is initially furnished thereto and continuing until this contract is terminated, except that the minimum monthly charge specified in this contract shall be equitably prorated for the billing period in which commencement and termination of this contract shall become effective.

(ii) The contractor hereby declares that rate schedules available hereunder are not in excess of the lowest rate schedules now available to any prospective customer, under like conditions of service, and agrees that during the life of this contract Government shall continue to have available the lowest available rate for similar conditions of service.

(iii) Recognition is given to the fact that the Government fiscal year ends on June 30. Payments hereunder shall be contingent upon the availability of appropriations therefor, and shall not be made in advance of service rendered.

(iv) All bills for service shall be paid without penalty or interest and the Government shall be entitled to any discounts customarily applicable to payment of bills by all customers of the contractor.

(v) Invoices for service rendered hereunder shall contain statements of the meter readings at the beginning of the billing period, meter constants, consumption during the billing period and such other pertinent data as shall be required by the Government.

2. TECHNICAL PROVISIONS

(a) Measurement of service: (i) All service furnished by the contractor shall be measured by suitable metering equipment of standard manufacture, to be furnished, installed, maintained, calibrated and read by the contractor at its expense. When more than a single meter is installed at the service location, the readings thereof shall be billed conjunctively. In the event any meter fails to register or registers incorrectly the service furnished therethrough, the parties shall agree upon the length of the period during which such meter failed to register or registered incorrectly and the quantity of service delivered therethrough during such period and, upon agreement, an appropriate adjustment based thereon shall be made in the Government's bills. For the purpose of the preceding sentence, any meter which registers not more than 2 percent slow or fast shall be deemed correct.

(ii) Contractor, as far as possible, shall read all meters on the last regular working day of the month. All billings based on meter readings of less than 26 days or more than 35 days shall be prorated accordingly.

(b) Meter test: The contractor, at its expense, shall periodically inspect and test the meters installed by it at intervals not exceeding 1 year. At the written request of the contracting officer the contractor shall make additional tests of any or all of such meters in the presence of Government representatives. The cost of such additional tests shall be borne by the Government if the percentage of error is found to be not more than 2 percent slow or fast. No meter shall be placed in service or allowed to remain in service which has an error in registration in excess of 2 percent under normal operating conditions.

(c) Change in volume or character: Reasonable notice shall, so far as possible, be given by the contracting officer to the contractor respecting any material changes proposed in the volume or characteristics of the utility service required at each location.

(d) Continuity of service and consumption: (i) The contractor shall use reasonable diligence to provide a regular and uninterrupted supply of service at the service location, but shall not be liable for damages, breach of contract or otherwise to the Government for failure, suspension, diminution or other variations of service occasioned by or in consequence of any cause beyond the control of the contractor, including but not limited to acts of God or of the public enemy, fires, floods, earthquakes, or other catastrophes, strikes, or failure or breakdown of transmission or other facilities: *Provided*, That when any such failure, suspension, diminution, or variation of service shall aggregate more than 10 hours during any billing period hereunder, an equitable adjustment shall be made in the monthly rates specified in this contract (including the minimum monthly charge).

(ii) In the event the Government is unable to operate the service location in whole or in part for any cause beyond its control, including but not limited to acts of God or of the public enemy, fires, floods, earthquakes, or other catastrophes, or strikes, an equitable adjustment shall be made in the monthly rates specified in this contract (including the minimum monthly charge)

if the period during which the Government is unable to operate such service location in whole or in part shall exceed 15 days during any billing period hereunder.

3. RATES AND CHARGES

(a) For all service furnished under this contract to the service location the Government shall pay the contractor at the rate schedule, exhibit A, attached hereto and made a part of this contract.

(b) For purposes of charges under paragraph (a) of this clause any demands due to faulty operation of, or excessive or fluctuating pressure on, the contractor's system shall not be included as part of the Government's demand.

4. CONTRACTOR'S FACILITIES

(a) The contractor, at his expense, shall furnish, install, operate, and maintain all facilities required to furnish service hereunder to and measure such service as of the point of delivery specified in the service specification. Title to all such facilities shall be and remain in the contractor, and the contractor shall be responsible for all loss of or damage to such facilities.

(b) The Government hereby grants to the contractor, free of any rental or similar charge, but subject to the limitations specified in this contract, a revocable permit to enter the service location for any proper purpose under this contract, including use of the site or sites agreed upon by the parties hereto for the installation, operation, and maintenance of the facilities of the contractor required to be located upon Government premises, all of which facilities shall be and remain the sole property of the contractor and shall, at all times during the life of this contract, be operated and maintained by the contractor at its expense; and all taxes and other charges in connection therewith, together with all liability arising out of the negligence of the contractor in the construction, operation, or maintenance of such facilities shall be assumed by the contractor. Authorized representatives of the contractor will be allowed access to the facilities of the contractor at suitable times to perform the obligations of the contractor with respect to such facilities. Such facilities shall be removed and Government premises restored to their original condition by the contractor at its expense within a reasonable time after the Government shall revoke the permit herein granted and in any event within a reasonable time after termination of this contract, provided that in the event of termination due to fault of the contractor such facilities may be retained in place at the option of the Government until service comparable to that provided for hereunder is obtained elsewhere. It is expressly understood, however, that proper military or governmental authority may limit or restrict the right of access herein granted in any manner considered by such authority to be necessary for the national security.

5. PUBLIC REGULATION AND CHANGE OF RATES

(a) Public regulation: Service furnished under this contract shall be subject to regulation in the manner and to the extent prescribed by law by any Federal, State, or local regulatory commission having jurisdiction. If during the term of this contract the public regulatory commission having jurisdiction receives for file in authorized manner rates that are higher or rates that are lower than those stipulated herein for like conditions of service, the contractor agrees to continue to furnish service as stipulated in this contract and the Government agrees to pay for such service at the higher or lower rates from and after the date when such rates are made effective.

(b) Change of rates: (i) Subject to paragraph (a) of this clause, in the event the contractor, during the term of this contract,

shall make effective any new rate schedule or amended rate schedule applicable to the class of service furnished the Government at the service location which may contain a lower rate or conditions more favorable to the Government for such class of service, the contractor shall forward to the contracting officer a copy of such rate schedule or amended rate schedule within fifteen (15) days after the effective date thereof, and, upon receipt of written request from the Government, shall substitute such rate schedule or amended rate schedule for the rate schedule then in effect hereunder for such service location, commencing with the billing period in which such written request is received.

(ii) Subject to paragraph (a) of this clause, in the event of a permanent change in the class of service furnished the Government at the service location, service shall, effective sixty (60) days after written request is made by either party or at such other time as may be agreed upon, thereafter be furnished to such service location at the lowest available rate schedule of the contractor which is applicable to the class of service furnished following such permanent change.

6. OFFICIALS NOT TO BENEFIT

No Member of or Delegate to Congress, or Resident Commissioner, shall be admitted to any share or part of this contract, or to any benefit that may arise therefrom; but this provision shall not be construed to extend to this contract if made with a corporation for its general benefit.

7. COVENANT AGAINST CONTINGENT FEES

The contractor warrants that no person or selling agency has been employed or retained to solicit or secure this contract upon an agreement or understanding for a commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee, excepting bona fide employees or bona fide established commercial or selling agencies maintained by the contractor for the purpose of securing business. For breach or violation of this warranty the Government shall have the right to annul this contract without liability or in its discretion to deduct from the contract price or consideration the full amount of such commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee.

8. ASSIGNMENT OF CLAIMS

No claim under this contract shall be assigned.

9. CONVICT LABOR

In connection with the performance of work under this contract, the contractor agrees not to employ any person undergoing sentence of imprisonment at hard labor.

10. NONDISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

In connection with the performance of work under this contract, the contractor agrees not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin; and further agrees to insert the foregoing provision in all subcontracts hereunder except subcontracts for standard commercial supplies or for raw materials.

11. DISPUTES

Except as otherwise provided in this contract, any dispute concerning a question of fact arising under this contract which is not disposed of by agreement shall be decided by the contracting officer, who shall reduce his decision to writing and mail or otherwise furnish a copy thereof to the contractor. Within 30 days from the date of receipt of such copy, the contractor may appeal by mailing or otherwise furnishing to the contracting officer a written appeal addressed to the head of the agency, and the decision of the head of the agency, or his duly authorized representative for the hearing of such appeals shall be final and conclusive: *Provided*, That if no such appeal is taken, the decision of the contracting officer shall

be final and conclusive. In connection with any appeal proceeding from this clause, the contractor shall be afforded an opportunity to be heard and to offer evidence in support of its appeal. Pending final decision of a dispute hereunder, the contractor shall proceed diligently with the performance of the contract in accordance with the contracting officer's decision.

12. DEFINITIONS

As used throughout this contract, the following terms shall have the meanings set forth below:

(a) The term "contracting officer" means the person executing this contract on behalf of the Government, and any other officer or civilian employee who is a properly designated contracting officer; and the term includes, except as otherwise provided in this contract, the authorized representative of a contracting officer acting within the limits of this authority.

(b) Except as provided in this contract, the term "subcontracts" includes purchase orders under this contract.

13. CONFLICTS

To the extent of any inconsistency between the provisions of this contract, any schedule, rider, or exhibit incorporated in this contract by reference or otherwise, or any of the contractor's rules and regulations, the provisions of this contract shall control.

In witness whereof, the parties hereto have executed this contract as of the day and year first above written.

THE UNITED STATES OF
AMERICA,

By E. H. CHAMBERLIN,
Contracting Officer.
VIRGINIA ELECTRIC &
POWER Co.,

By M. C. SMITH,
Vice President.

CERTIFICATE

I, L. G. Parrish, certify that I am the assistant secretary of the corporation named as contractor in the foregoing contract; that M. C. Smith, who signed said contract on behalf of the contractor, was then vice president of said corporation; that said contract was duly signed for and in behalf of said corporation by authority of its governing body and is within the scope of its corporate powers.

L. G. PARRISH.

ELECTRIC SERVICE SPECIFICATIONS

1. Premises to be served: Langley Field, Va.

2. Estimated service requirements: Estimated maximum demand, off-peak kilowatts, 150,000; on-peak kilowatts, 70,000. Estimated annual consumption, 120,000,000 kilowatt-hours. (The Government is in no way obligated to use nor is it restricted to the above-estimated requirements except as provided in paragraph 12 of these specifications.)

3. Point of delivery: The point of delivery of service hereunder shall be where contractor's facilities are connected to Government's facilities at Stratton Road substation.

4. Description of electric service: Contractor will supply three-phase, three-wire grounded neutral alternating current service at approximately 60 cycles and at a nominal line voltage level of 110,000. The voltage level and regulation will be as provided in paragraph 10 hereof.

5. Service connections: Service shall be over three 110-kilovolt transmission lines. One of these lines is to be the existing line with such modifications as are necessary. The second line shall be an additional 110-kilovolt circuit between Chesterfield Station and Langley Field. The third line will be run across the James River in the vicinity of Newport News and shall extend to the transmission system of the contractor on the south side of the river.

The three lines shall be terminated in a switch and terminal yard to be installed and maintained by contractor. Government agrees to the use of space on Langley Field adjacent to the Yorktown Road and coincident insofar as practicable with the area to be traversed by the service lines. Contractor shall install two circuits of 500,000 circular mill copper or equivalent between its terminal structure and Government's Stratton Road substation without imposing dead-end strains on Government's structure in excess of 2,000 pounds per wire.

6. Meters: The contractor shall supply metering equipment suitable for measuring the service with an accuracy consistent with established practices for the character of service rendered. The meters shall be located in contractor's station on the terminal of the line.

7. Meter readings: Meters shall be read on the last working day of each month by the contractor in the presence of a representative of Government. Whenever contractor performs adjustments or calibrations of the metering equipment a representative of Government shall be present. It is agreed that all metering equipment used for billing purposes may be sealed by both the contractor and Government and no seals will be broken except in the presence of both.

8. Use of service: The service shall be used primarily for the operation of National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (NACA) at Langley Field, however, Government reserves the privilege of serving other needs of Government at Langley Field with or without an exchange of funds between Government agencies. Government furthermore reserves the right to sell service to contractors engaged in actual construction work at Langley Field.

9. Parallel operation: (a) The Diesel-electric generating plant of Government may be used in parallel operation with the service by contractor. It is understood that the plant will not be used to supply the base load of the Government but will only be used as a peak-load plant to reduce the maximum demand on the contractor's service. The plant may be operated for other purposes by mutual agreement or for the supply of electric energy to the contractor as provided by separate contract.

(b) Within its reasonable ability to do so, without jeopardizing or impairing its own operations, Government will make electricity available to contractor during contractor's emergencies. Contractor shall notify Government of its expected emergency requirements as much in advance of such emergency as is possible, giving the schedule of expected requirements. Oral notice of contractor's emergency requirements shall be immediately confirmed in writing, stating that a curtailment in the supply of electricity is imminent or in effect.

(c) Contractor shall pay Government for all electricity generated by Government at contractor's request under paragraph 9 (b). Such electricity shall be determined by reading the integrating meter or meters at the Government's power plant. Said meter reading shall be taken by the Government and supplied to contractor as requested by contractor. At the end of each of contractor's billing periods, Government shall bill contractor for emergency electricity, generated at contractor's request, using the same overall unit cost per kilowatt hour as was used by the contractor in billing Government under exhibit A of this contract during the next preceding billing period when no emergency electricity was generated by Government at contractor's request. The kilowatt hours supplied and billed Government under this contract for each billing period during which emergency service is supplied by contractor shall be the total kilowatt hours generated by Government for contractor, plus the kilowatt hours delivered to Government by con-

tractor, less the kilowatt hours delivered by Government into contractor's system.

10. Voltage regulation: The contractor shall provide regulated voltage which shall not exceed a band width of 105,000 volts minimum and 110,000 volts maximum under all permissible load conditions of this contract. Contractor shall install, own, maintain, and operate the necessary condenser capacity located adjacent to contractor's terminal structure. Facilities to permit convenient control of contractor's condenser capacity by Government shall be installed by contractor and Government will control, at contractor's direction, contractor's condenser capacity, to maintain operating voltage levels mutually agreed upon from time to time. Government will control this equipment only when its load dispatcher is on duty. No liability will accrue to Government for such control.

11. Power factor: The minimum power factor of the load will be maintained by Government to 95 percent lag for all loads between 70,000 and 150,000 kilowatts. Smaller demands may be at a lower power factor, but will not exceed 21,600 regulated kilowatt-ampere flow to Government.

12. Power available: The maximum power available to Government hereunder during on-peak hours and during off-peak hours is delineated on exhibit B. Instantaneous swings will be limited to 10,000 kilowatts above the maxima indicated. This is not to be interpreted as applying to malfunction or failure of equipment.

13. Rate of change of power: The Government shall regulate its use of power so as not to exceed a rate of change of power of 10,000 kilowatts per minute under all operating conditions. This is not to be interpreted as applying to emergency shut-down in the event of malfunction or failures of equipment.

14. Grounding and relaying: The contractor shall furnish all necessary grounding and relaying equipment necessary for discriminating control of system faults occurring at or on the contractor's side of the service connection. Government will cooperate with the contractor in the coordination of its relaying and switching practices. Carrier equipment and relaying equipment now owned by Government may be coordinated into any mutually agreed upon relaying and protective system desired by the contractor.

The contractor and Government mutually agree to exchange freely data on system characteristics, relaying, protection, switching, performance characteristics, machinery characteristics, and all other engineering information to permit intelligent planning, design, and operation by both parties.

All relays that control the 110-kilovolt oil circuit breakers protecting contractor's 110-kilovolt lines and services to Government shall periodically be tested, set, and sealed by contractor. Said relays shall be tested and set in the presence of Government's representatives at settings determined by contractor. Initial settings and subsequent changes in settings of said relays shall be made by contractor after reasonable notice to Government. After reasonable notice to contractor, and with reasonable frequency, Government may require contractor to test and check the settings of any of said relays.

Government shall be provided with remote control of these lines at its switchboard for manual switching and for relay operation of service breakers to protect Government's equipment.

15. Operational communication: Government shall cooperate in notifying contractor daily in advance of its schedule of operations which will cause material changes in the demand on contractor.

In the event instant notification of load changes are required by the contractor, the

necessary communication facilities will be provided and maintained at the contractor's expense.

EXHIBIT A

I. APPLICABILITY

This schedule is applicable to a contract demand of 70,000 kilowatts on-peak and 150,000 kilowatts off-peak.

II. RATE

(a) Monthly charge: First 5,000 kilowatts or less on-peak demand, \$5,900; all over 5,000 kilowatts on-peak demand, \$1 per kilowatt; all off-peak demand in excess of on-peak demand, 20 cents per kilowatt.

(b) Excess of on-peak contract demand: At any time during on-peak hours, if contractor agrees to and does make available to Government demand in excess of on-peak contract demand and Government uses this excess demand, such excess of the on-peak contract demand shall be treated for billing purposes as though it had been used during the off-peak hours (10 p. m. to 7 a. m.). In this case the on-peak demand used for billing shall not be less than the on-peak contract demand.

(c) Monthly energy charge:

	Cents per kilowatt-hour
First 200 kilowatt-hours per kilowatt of demand	0.45
Next 200 kilowatt-hours per kilowatt of demand	.40
All over 400 kilowatt-hours per kilowatt of demand	.30

III. MINIMUM MONTHLY CHARGE

The minimum monthly charge will be the demand charge of the highest of the following:

- (1) Current on-peak and off-peak measured demand.
- (2) Seventy-five percent of the highest firm on-peak demand used for billing purposes during the preceding 11 months, or 25-percent of the contract demand during the first year following the date of initial delivery, 50-percent of the contract demand during the second year following the date of initial delivery and 75 percent of the contract demand for the remainder of the term of the agreement.

IV. DETERMINATION OF DEMAND

(a) The on-peak demand to be used in paragraph II (a) shall be determined each month by taking 75 percent of the highest average kilowatt load plus 25 percent of the highest average kilovolt-ampere load measured over any period of 30 consecutive minutes between the hours of 7 a. m. and 10 p. m. daily, except that the demand used for billing shall not be less than 75 percent of the demand established during the previous 11 months.

(b) The off-peak demand to be used in paragraph II (a) shall be determined each month by taking 75 percent of the highest average kilowatt load plus 25 percent of the highest average kilovolt-ampere load measured over any period of 30 consecutive minutes except between 7 a. m. and 10 p. m. daily.

(c) Demand to be used in paragraph II (c) shall be the measured monthly demand as determined in paragraph IV (a).

V. FUEL CLAUSE

When the cost of fuel to the company, as determined under the standard classification of accounts approved by the commission, is 1.0 cent or more above or below 14.0 cents per million B. t. u., then for each whole 0.5 cent variation above or below 14.0 cents per million B. t. u. the cost of energy delivered hereunder shall be increased or decreased at the rate of 0.0075 cent per kilowatt-hour.

This charge for each current month shall be based on costs recorded during the second preceding calendar month.

APPEAL FOR EXPEDITIOUS ACTION ON THE BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make an appeal to Senators to be present on the floor of the Senate tomorrow at 12 o'clock. As I stated the other day, we have an average of three quorum calls a day; and it takes 20 minutes, on the average, to obtain a quorum. That amounts to a total of an hour a day which we lose every day on quorum calls; and an hour a day for 5 days amounts to 5 hours. In other words, we are losing from the time of the Senate one legislative day a week, as a result of quorum calls.

I hope Senators will be present tomorrow at noon, so that we can proceed with consideration of the joint resolution of the Senator from Nevada and can quickly dispose of it, and then resume the consideration of the appropriation bill. I hope we can make more progress tomorrow with the consideration of that bill than we have made in the last few days.

Mr. President, I wish to say further, that unless we can make more progress on these bills we shall have to have some evening sessions. I hope we will not have to resort to them; I hope we can proceed with their consideration and dispose of them without having to hold evening sessions.

MEETING OF APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, we are getting behind with the appropriation bills. For 2½ months we have been holding hearings on the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments appropriation bill. The House has not yet passed that bill; it probably will pass it next week.

In the Appropriations Committee, we are dealing with the State Department appropriations phase of that bill. At 7 o'clock this evening we shall hold a meeting in an attempt to complete action on the State Department division of that bill. We shall greatly appreciate it if the members of the subcommittee will attend the meeting at room F-82 for several hours this evening.

PRICING PRACTICES—MODIFICATION OF UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I spoke to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] about a modification of the unanimous-consent agreement which was entered into on July 2 in regard to the bill (S. 719) to establish beyond doubt that, under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor. At that time I forgot to place in the agreement the usual provision that in case the Senator

who is in charge of the bill favors an amendment which has been proposed, the time in opposition to the amendment will be in the control of the minority leader.

Therefore, Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to modify the unanimous-consent agreement by making the following insertion in it, after the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], where it appears the second time; "but in the event Mr. KEFAUVER is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader [Mr. WHERRY] or some Senator designated by him."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the requested modification of the unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and the modification is made.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I call up my amendment on page 5 of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, in line 4, it is proposed to strike out "\$2,314,400" and insert "\$2,814,400."

On page 5, line 3, after the word "granted", it is proposed to insert: "Provided, That \$500,000 of the amount appropriated herein shall be available for purchase of electric power and energy and for leasing of transmission lines and related facilities of others."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Oklahoma is proposing an amendment to the next committee amendment which was passed over, and which is in order at this time. We have just disposed of the committee amendment on page 4. Now the Senator from Oklahoma is offering an amendment to increase the amount of money proposed in the committee amendment on page 5, line 4.

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma is submitted to a committee amendment, the committee amendment should first be reported stated before amendments are offered to it.

The next committee amendment previously passed over will be stated.

The next amendment passed over was, under the subhead "Construction, Southwestern Power Administration," on page 5, line 4, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$3,375,000" and insert "\$2,314,400, of which not to exceed \$586,800 shall be available for personal services, and."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma proposes to amend that amendment by increasing

the amount and by earmarking a part of the increase.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the part increasing the amount is an amendment to the committee amendment, but that the remainder of the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma is an amendment to the bill. In other words, the Senator's amendment seems to be double barreled. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. I believe it is an amendment to the committee amendment, because the committee amendment struck out a proviso at the same place in the bill where the proviso which I offer in my amendment would be inserted.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then there would be two amendments.

Mr. KERR. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the latter part of the Senator's amendment were placed at the end of the paragraph, it would be in order.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, in that regard I should like to say that I deeply regret the action the Senate has taken today with reference to the continuing fund. However, I am convinced that many Senators voted as they did on the amendment because they felt that the old continuing fund would give the Administrator powers which they described as being ones which would usurp certain legislative powers. I am convinced that many of the Senators who voted in favor of the committee amendment are just as anxious to make it possible for the REA to operate and for the Southwestern Power Administration to operate with them, as though those Senators had voted the other way.

Mr. President, I am convinced that the amendment I am now offering to the committee amendment would enable the Southwestern Power Administration, through a legislative act and appropriation by the Congress, to perform its functions in accordance with its contract for the fiscal year. Therefore, I ask that my amendment to the committee amendment be accepted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma to the amendment of the committee on page 5, line 4.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, no yeand-nay vote was taken on the amendment just offered by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. I desire to say I think that what he has suggested is the proper way by which the authorization should be made. I had already asked the Senator whether a legislative committee had ever considered such a proposal, and I understood him to say he did not know. He had not had a chance, of course, to search the record. I was one of the Senators who believed that the revolving fund was being used for purposes other than the purposes intended by the provision in the present law. I think the Senator from Oklahoma has proposed the proper way to legislate in the matter of aid to the REA's, and I want the RECORD to show

that I voted in the affirmative on his amendment, in order to provide the necessary appropriation.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for his statement, and I would like to say for the RECORD that he is one of the Senators with whom I conferred in the preparation and submission of the amendment. I did so feeling that he was for the end sought by the amendment, and I wish to thank him for what he has said.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the same paragraph.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I had intended to make certain observations on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, but had no opportunity. I was on my feet, addressing the Chair, but I was not recognized, and the vote was taken. I do not know yet, and I do not think any other Senator, except perhaps the Senator from Oklahoma, knows exactly what the amendment, which has been offered and adopted post-haste, will do. I frankly say I do not know. But I want to say now that if it does what it might well do, I shall move to reconsider the vote by which it was agreed to. I shall not do it today. My understanding from the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] was that the amendment would be explained today and would be voted on tomorrow. Instead, it was rushed through without any Senator getting an opportunity to read it, much less to understand it.

I believe that a thorough understanding of substantive legislation should be had by the United States Senate before it adopts a completely new policy in any field. I believe this particular amendment will, in effect, have that result. Perhaps it will not, but we should have had an opportunity to hear it discussed and to study it before we voted upon it.

I call attention to the fact that it provides for \$500,000 for the purchase of electrical energy. It does not indicate what is to be done with the energy purchased. There is no authority for making such a purchase, other than what is found in this amendment. The action of the Senate, I say with all due deference, may have been taken in ignorance, because the Senate did not understand the situation.

The amendment may well result in confirming contracts which were the basis of the action taken by the Senate a little while ago when, after thorough debate, it adopted the committee amendment, limiting the effect of the continuing fund.

I want to do anything that can be done to straighten out the situation in Oklahoma, and I will do it; but I do not believe we should be whipped into doing it in the way it was done, and tomorrow, after a careful study of it, I may offer a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Kerr amendment was adopted.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have an amendment, marked "7-9-51-C," which pertains to this paragraph which has

been amended, which I should like to call up and have considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is it an amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. CASE. It is an amendment in line 8.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest that we are now on a different amendment. It seems that the Senator's amendment is an amendment to the next amendment, which has not yet been acted upon. The question now is on the committee amendment as amended. The Senator's amendment apparently comes later on, to a different part. The question is on the amendment as amended.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, again we are faced with a situation which arises by virtue of the amendment, as amended. In what I deem to be fairness to Members of this body, who are entitled to know what they are doing before they do it, in my opinion this matter should go over until tomorrow, in order that Senators may have an opportunity to study the present situation with respect to this particular amendment and its legal effects.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have been trying to get the floor. I wanted to move that the Senate recess, because I had told Senators I was going to do that, and I do not think it would be fair to vote on the matter now, after some of the Senators have left the floor.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I would be happy to yield the floor for the purpose of a motion to recess.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the

nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edward Jordan Dimock to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Cyril Michael to be United States attorney for the district court of the Virgin Islands.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Harvey Erickson to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Washington.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Loomis E. Cranor to be United States marshal for the western district of Kentucky.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Wayne Bezona to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask that the nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 11, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate July 10 (legislative day of June 27), 1951:

IN THE ARMY

Col. Bickford Edward Sawyer, O8349, United States Army, for appointment as Chief of Finance, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 10 (legislative day of June 27), 1951:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Edward Jordan Dimock to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Cyril Michael to be United States attorney for the district court of the Virgin Islands.

Harvey Erickson to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Washington. (Now serving under an appointment which expired February 7, 1951.)

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Loomis E. Cranor to be United States marshal for the western district of Kentucky.

Wayne Bezona to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

To be medical director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel), effective date of acceptance

James A. Shannon

To be senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective date of acceptance

E. Ross Jenney

To be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Charles E. Smith

Gert L. Laqueur

William J. Card

To be sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Ralph J. Van Derwerker

Harry W. Poston

To be junior assistant pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

David E. Sutliff

Carl H. Brown

Bertram J. Baughman

To be nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Margaret T. De Lawter

To be assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant)

Dade W. Moeller

Roy O. McCaldin

Richard D. Coleman

Charles V. Wright, Jr.

John V. Miner, Jr.

Gordon E. Stone

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, JULY 10, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast revealed Thyself as a presence to strengthen and a light to lead, may this new day be rich in the realization of Thy divine power and guidance.

Grant that we may be endowed with a faith which will make us victorious over all the dark and disquieting moods that frequently baffle and play such havoc with our souls.

May we have within our hearts that peace which is begotten of simple trust in Thee, and may we realize more fully that when we have Thee we have everything.

Fill us with an eager desire to know and do Thy will, and may we follow faithfully and courageously the ways of righteousness and justice which Thou hast marked out for us.

May we be united in the service of our beloved country, not merely striving to the utmost to dethrone and destroy the gods of war but seeking to build a nation that is spiritually minded lest the darkness of secularism and materialism and atheism descend upon us.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

GEN. JAMES A. VAN FLEET

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I note with pride and gratification the promotion of James A. Van Fleet, commander of the Eighth Army in Korea, to the rank of full general.

A distinguished son of Florida, General Van Fleet has done an outstanding job throughout his career. He has shown particular skill and ability in coping with Communist military tactics. In plainer words, he whipped them in Greece and he whipped them in Korea. His rank and stature have been earned the hard way.

He is clearly one of America's ablest present-day military leaders.

JOSEPH A. MYERS ET AL.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 953) for the relief of Joseph A. Myers, Hazel C. Myers, and Helen Myers, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$1,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTROL OF INFLATION

(Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is now perfectly obvious that the Democratic Party has no genuine desire to curb inflation. The solid vote of the Democrats yesterday against a Republican proposal declaring as a matter of policy that the present authority of the Secretary of the Treasury and Federal Reserve Board to exercise control on credit, bank deposits, and public financing concurrently with the direct controls of prices and wages makes it readily apparent that they intend to make a political issue of the distressing conditions caused by inflation. This is natural and understandable because it means thousands of jobs to their faithful followers and gives them an opportunity of paying lip service to the plight of the distressed consumer but it does not indicate a proper regard for the national welfare. Though understandable, it is unpardonable.

Certainly the existing laws with respect to indirect control of our credit and money supply were intended to be used and used effectively to control either inflation or deflation. The refusal by the Democrats to use these powers is unforgivable and shows their colors in striking contrast to the flag of genuine statesmanship. For 20 years Truman and his cohorts have fooled the American public. Certainly the country can not withstand their mismanagement much longer. Complete socialism or bankruptcy, or both, is the inevitable result of the policies of the Democratic Party.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

MAKING PEACE WITH GERMANY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, according to the press a message, or a letter, has been sent by the President to the House and the Senate with reference to making peace with Germany. I should like to know if that message has been

delivered to the House, or if it is available.

The SPEAKER. It has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed.

Mr. RANKIN. Has it been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

The SPEAKER. It has not.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks and include a resolution to declare the war at an end, a resolution I introduced on February 28 of this year.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution is as follows:

House Joint Resolution 177

Joint resolution terminating the state of war between the United States and the Imperial Government of Japan and between the United States and the Government of Germany

Resolved, etc., That the state of war declared to exist between the United States and the Imperial Government of Japan by joint resolution of Congress approved December 8, 1941 (55 Stat. 795), is hereby declared at an end.

Sec. 2. The state of war declared to exist between the United States and the Government of Germany by joint resolution of Congress approved December 11, 1941 (55 Stat. 796), is hereby declared at an end.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. When can we have an opportunity to vote on that proposition?

The SPEAKER. When it is reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. RANKIN. Are we going to have to wait on them?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. That will probably be after the next war, I am afraid.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know anything about that.

Mr. RANKIN. If we should get into a war with Communist Russia we would need the help of the German people. The sooner we make peace with them the better it is going to be for us, as well as for them, and for our white Christian civilization as a whole.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1952

Mr. ROONEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 685) which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the

to use the North Carolina Education Association to deal with any grievances which they had rather than to organize a union among the teachers.

The newspapers and the public of North Carolina have been outraged by this action on the part of the United States Army. Personally I resent the Army permitting any labor union or any other minority group to dictate a policy and to veto the appointment of a capable and well-qualified man on a mission of this character merely because the union does not like his views. I wish to enter my very solemn protest against this action, and to say that I think it deserves severe censure. Since when has the American Federation of Labor obtained the right to dictate to the people of the United States in determining appointments to be made by its United States Army?

I am enclosing two editorials which express the sentiment of the people of North Carolina with reference to this matter, one from the Charlotte Observer and the other from the Greensboro Daily News. Similar editorials have appeared in a number of other North Carolina papers.

I should like to know if it has become the policy of the United States Army to let minority groups dictate the selection or veto appointments made by the Army.

Yours very truly,

CLYDE R. HOEY.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is the committee amendment on page 5, line 4, as amended.

Mr. MALONE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	McKellar
Bricker	Hennings	Millikin
Bridges	Hill	Monroney
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Moody
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Morse
Byrd	Humphrey	Mundt
Cain	Hunt	Neely
Capehart	Ives	Nixon
Carlson	Jenner	O'Connor
Case	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Cordon	Kern	Russell
Dirksen	Kerr	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Duff	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Lehman	Stennis
Eaton	Lodge	Taft
Ellender	Long	Thye
Ferguson	Magnuson	Underwood
Flanders	Malone	Watkins
Frear	McCarran	Welker
Fulbright	McCarthy	Wherry
George	McClellan	Williams
Hayden	McFarland	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent by leave of the Senate, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are ab-

sent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, speaking for the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and myself I ask unanimous consent that the figure of \$2,814,400, on page 5, line 4, of the committee amendment, as amended, be reduced by \$250,000, so as to make the figure read \$2,564,400. The same change should be made at page 5, line 8, in the proviso, as agreed to, so as to make the figure read \$250,000, instead of \$500,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma refer to the amendment which he offered yesterday to the committee amendment?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I understand the facts, the entire requirement to meet the emergencies involved, according to the budget estimate, was \$198,000. I understand that \$300,000 was included in the bill prior to the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma to the committee amendment. Therefore, I cannot see why \$250,000 would be required.

Mr. KERR. I say to the distinguished Senator that in the time that I have had to study the matter—and I have devoted a good deal of time to it since last evening—the best estimate I can give at the present time is in accordance with what I have just stated.

I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the \$300,000 to which he refers is not available for spending on the basis of the amount included in the amendment I offered to the committee amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely say that at page 8044 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, July 10, there appears a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, containing the following figures:

Nineteen hundred and fifty-two (estimated): Continuing fund expenditure, \$198,000.

Mr. KERR. That is with reference to certain items, but others were taken into consideration, Mr. President, in arriving at the figure which I am now using.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I understand, the original language which was amended by the McCarran amendment, was in the budget estimate for 1952, and the entire amount of the budget estimate was \$198,000. Now does the Senator wish by his amendment to the committee amendment to include items other than those which could have been provided for prior to the McCarran amendment?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. I think a little further reading of the RECORD may clarify this particular matter.

The estimate of \$198,000, appearing in the letter of the Secretary of the Interior under date of July 10, while it is said to be the estimate of the amount to be paid from the continuing fund, is in fact the estimate of the amount that will come from the continuing fund for the purpose for which the Senator from Oklahoma has submitted his amendment to the committee amendment, to effectuate for 1 year the contracts which are outstanding. In other words, the Secretary did not attempt to estimate what might be needed for emergency repairs, because that is obviously an impossibility; and he indicates that in his letter when he says:

You will note that we expect to receive a total revenue of \$2,280,000 in the current fiscal year without the use of the continuing fund. It is anticipated that in fiscal year 1952 the continuing fund will have to provide \$198,000 for the purchase of power and service charges under the Oklahoma contract with private utilities.

So there he explains that the \$198,000 was not submitted as an estimate to cover any emergency repairs or to guarantee the continuity of service on Federal lines, but it was dedicated to the purpose the Senator mentions.

If I may make a further statement at this time, let me say that in discussions had this morning with representatives of the Southwestern Power Administration, my attention was called to the fact that at the time when this estimate was prepared, and was used as a basis for the Secretary's letter, there were not then in contemplation certain lines which can be made usable in the coming fiscal year 1952.

Mr. KERR. And which it is thought will be made available.

Mr. CORDON. If those lines are put into use, then an additional fund will be needed.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oregon is entirely correct.

Mr. CORDON. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars would appear under those circumstances to be a reasonable amount to cover whatever obligations will be faced by the Administrator for the fiscal year 1952.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his statements. They are in line with discussions which I had with representatives of the Southwestern Power Administration.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Yesterday I announced that I would move today to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma to the amendment was adopted. I have gone into the figures, and have done what I could in the way of studying the amendment. It seems to me there is an immediate necessity for this amount of money to carry on the operations of the Southwestern Power Administration for the fiscal year 1952. From my viewpoint, there is no ratification of anything for which this matter stands as an appropriation by the Federal Congress as an operating item in the handling of the business of the Southwestern Power Administration, and I myself have no objection to the figure as it has been amended by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to call to the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Oregon an item on page 607 of the budget for 1952:

PROGRAM AND PERFORMANCE

A continuing fund of \$300,000, consisting of power receipts, is used to defray expenses incurred under emergency conditions—

I emphasize the words "emergency conditions"—

to insure the continuity of electric service and continuous operation of the facilities within the southwestern power area, and to cover all costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy and rentals for the use of facilities for the transmission and distribution of electric power and energy to public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies (16 U. S. C. 825s-1.)

The estimate for 1952 is \$198,000.

Is the Senator aware of that?

Mr. KERR. I am aware of the paragraph and the figures to which the Senator from Michigan has referred. I call his attention to the fact that under the continuing fund authorization, the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration was impowered to carry on certain operations and to pay certain costs, and had the money available, through the continuing fund, for that purpose.

In view of the fact that the continuing fund authority is now taken away, and in view of the fact that his expenditures must be limited to funds actually appropriated, it has been thought, on the basis of the best calculation which can be given to me, that \$250,000 is the minimum which he feels will meet the requirements. It is on the basis of that information, Mr. President, that I have requested unanimous consent that the amount agreed to yesterday, in the sum of \$500,000, be reduced to \$250,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I call this matter to the attention of the Senate because I feel that when this amendment goes to conference, the conferees should be mindful of what was in the appropriation budget; and as I read the figures, the \$300,000 can still be used for the purposes of emergency, as originally provided for. It was to keep an enormous sum, running up into the millions of dollars, from being used for that purpose, that the Senator from Nevada had offered his amendment.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I did not yield except for a question. If the Senator objects to the proposed reduction from \$500,000 to \$250,000, I think that should be stated.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am not going to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma, on behalf of himself and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that the figure \$2,814,400 in the amendment agreed to yesterday to the committee amendment on page 5 in line 4 be reduced by \$250,000, so as to make the figure read \$2,564,400, and that the same reduction be made in line 8, in the proviso, as previously agreed to, so as to make the figure read \$250,000, instead of \$500,000? The Chair hears no objection, and the amendment to the committee amendment will be so modified.

The question now is on the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment passed over will be stated.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 5, in line 8, after the word "granted", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That this appropriation shall not be expended for the construction of facilities designated as comprising the western Missouri project."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Members of the Senate, and submit for inclusion in the RECORD at this point, specific information which indicates the dire need of additional electric facilities and services proposed to be rendered in connection with Southwestern Power Administration's program.

I should like to point first to a wire I received recently from the Springfield Junior Chamber of Commerce, and to the survey made by the fact-finding committee of that organization in connection with the cost of power by one, building a steam-generated power plant; two, buying power from Empire District Electric Co.; and, three, using power from Bull Shoals Dam. The survey was made in connection with a bond issue which was defeated by the voters of Springfield in 1949. The Jaycee fact-finding committee spent many days and nights in this exhaustive study, and I should like to direct particular attention to the summary of their report. I ask unanimous consent that the telegram from the Springfield Junior Chamber of Commerce and the report of

survey be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPRINGFIELD, Mo., June 13, 1951.

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Springfield Junior Chamber of Commerce urges you to give utmost consideration in acting on short amendments which strips Springfield of SPA power lines from Bull Shoals Dam. For past 2 years Jaycees locally have been vitally interested in Springfield's power problem. A Jaycee survey based on months of exhaustive study convinced us that SPA power from Bull Shoals necessary to give us adequate power reserves. We believe short amendment could do more to work against this area's interest than any other piece of legislation yet proposed. Since the dam is already built, it is inconceivable that such an amendment should be attached to any bill. The Jaycees have always been in favor of economies in Government. The lines will cost the taxpayers nothing but save them thousands of dollars in rates. We therefore are urging defeat of the short amendment so that SPA lines can be built from Bull Shoals to Springfield.

SPRINGFIELD JUNIOR CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE.

To the Citizens of Springfield:

Months ago the Junior Chamber of Commerce became interested in a proposed referendum on the bond issue to provide funds for the building of a new steam plant to generate electric power for the city of Springfield. This referendum action would once again place this question before the voters of our city.

In order to transmit the interest of the Junior Chamber of Commerce into worthwhile community activities and service, the board of directors appointed a fact-finding committee to investigate and make public the facts concerning some of the highly controversial issues which were evidenced in the last bond issue election which was defeated. To obtain this information on an unbiased and factual basis, the fact-finding committee prepared a list of eight questions which were submitted to the chairman of the two groups which were arguing pro and con on the issue in question. These questions have been answered very ably. The committee which favored the bond issue presented its answer through Ann Fair Dodson, who submitted their report. The committee which opposed the bond issue presented its answer through M. D. Lightfoot, who authorized their report.

The Junior Chamber of Commerce Fact Finding Committee prepared the two sets of answers and reconciled the differences. In many cases, the answer arrived at as a result of the reconciliation was different from either the answer submitted by Mrs. Dodson or the answer submitted by Mr. Lightfoot.

The conclusions reached by the fact-finding committee of the junior chamber of commerce were not arrived at hastily. Many days and nights have been devoted to this study, and each answer was carefully weighed, and all pros and cons were discussed before the committee arrived at a conclusion. Much technical reference material was referred to and studied carefully, including the following: Burns and McDonnell, Consulting Engineers for City Utilities, Report of Power Supply, Springfield, 1945; Burns and McDonnell, Supplemental Report of Proposed Generating Station for Springfield, 1947; Burns and McDonnell Estimated Construction Cost of Proposed Generating

Station as of May 17, 1949; City Utilities Annual Reports of 1946-49; T. V. A. Manuals and Bulletins on Hydro-Electric Power; Barrow's Treatise on Water Power Engineering; letters from different individuals to the fact-finding committee, and the above-mentioned reports by Mrs. Dodson and Mr. Lightfoot.

Various individuals have been contacted and their opinions have been considered and carefully weighed. Among those individuals are Mr. Sprong, Mr. Rice, Mr. Challander, and Mr. A. P. Stone, Jr., representing the City Utilities; Mr. Douglas Wright, representing the Southwest Power Administration; and Mr. M. D. Lightfoot, representing the Citizens Committee.

It must be realized that the figures we have used in some cases are the result of projections and estimates based on future needs and development of the city and its electrical power needs. However, nearly every business and businessman, must look into the future to try and predict what the future will hold. While he might not always be correct in his predictions, he must furnish himself with a yardstick or basis by which he can make his plans for future work. That is what we have tried to do.

It must also be realized that our conclusions are the conclusions of laymen; by that I mean that no member of our committee is a technically trained expert on electric power, or on municipal utility management. However, the people of Springfield, who are really the owners of the city utilities, and whose vote is necessary to decide whether or not the steam generating plant should be built, are not technical experts either. Therefore, we believe that the junior chamber of commerce fact-finding committee is a qualified group to arrive at a conclusion on this vital question, as looked at through a layman's eyes. The fact-finding committee is a truly representative group. Don Roper is an accountant with the firm of Roper & Adkins, and is well qualified to figure projections, cost, revenue, and related topics. Guy McMillan is a businessman, associated with the International Business Machines Corp. James Woody is a feed manufacturer with the Tindle Milling Co., and is greatly concerned with our power supply and rate level as those factors affect the local businessman. James Matthews is an engineer, with the firm of Johnson & Robinett, and has the ability to estimate construction cost, fuel cost, and related topics. Douglas W. Greene, the chairman of the committee, who acted as moderator, and whose job it was to try and reconcile divergent points of view within the committee itself, is an attorney, with the firm of Mann, Mann, Walter & Powell.

We wish to emphasize, and to emphasize heavily, that not one of the fact-finding committee will receive any personal or financial gain as a result of the position we have taken. Instead we feel that we will be open to criticism from some sources. However, we have been honest and conscientious in our approach to the solution of this problem and it is our sincere hope that the future will prove that we are right. We wish to express our sincere thanks to all of those who generously contributed their time and their knowledge in an effort to help us in the conclusion of this problem.

We will now present the list of the eight questions which were submitted to the chairmen of the two groups which were arguing pro and con on the issue in question, and the answers to those questions which we have found, as the result of our research.

SPRINGFIELD POWER PLANT

Question 1. What is the estimated cost of the proposed steam plant, including a detailed breakdown of all costs?

Answer. The cost of the proposed steam plant itself does not appear to be much in

controversy. Insofar as this committee has been able to learn, the cost estimate as prepared by the Burns & McDonald Engineering Firm represents as true an estimate as can be obtained without actually preparing blueprints for the plant, and taking competitive bids from potential contractors.

The latest detailed estimate of this cost was submitted by Burns & McDonald engineering firm last May. I will not read each itemized amount in this May 1949 estimate, but for the sake of giving you a clear idea of how the cost is distributed I have grouped the items as follows:

For the power-plant building, including boiler foundation, stack and foundation, crane, intake, roads, drives, and walks.....	\$1,275,000
For the dam.....	882,000
For the purchase and clearing of the land for the reservoir.....	118,000
For the actual equipment, such as the 20,000-kilowatt turbine, generator, condensers, pumps, surge tanks, heaters, desorator, evaporator, water softener, steam generator, coal-handling system, ash-handling system, power wiring, switching station, two substations, 7½-mile transmission line, power piping, and circulating-water piping, including motor-operated sluice gates.....	3,040,000
For a gas line to the plant.....	110,000
Contingency allowances, overhead costs, and allowances for possible price increases....	955,000
This comes to a total of...	6,380,000

The best information available is that the present-day cost of this plant would not exceed such an amount and might come to very slightly less. It is pointed out that the requested amount in the recent bond issue was six and one-half million, which exceeds the estimated amount by \$120,000. This is a small percentage and would not appear to be out of order when it is remembered that the above is merely an estimate, and in the event that the project could be completed for less money the full amount of the bonds would not have to be issued.

Question 2. How does the investment cost per kilowatt of the proposed steam plant compare with the cost per kilowatt of similar projects under construction at the present time or that have been completed within the past 4 years?

Answer. In the beginning we should remember that the comparative value or utility of any kind of power depends primarily upon the cost of production, and that the initial investment in your plant must necessarily be reflected in this cost of production.

It should also be borne in mind that higher unit costs are usually caused by provision for future increases of capacity, as is the case of our own proposed steam plant. As you know, it is proposed that we install one 20,000 kilowatt generating unit, although the building would be of sufficient size to house an additional 20,000 kilowatt generating unit at some future date when the additional capacity was required. Therefore, it is assumed that costs will lower materially as these increases are made.

Our committee investigated the answers and references given by both sides. We found that in using \$6,380,000 as the cost of a completed power plant in Springfield and including allowances for contingencies and possible price increases, and excluding possible reductions, the cost per kilowatt of the proposed 20,000-kilowatt plant is \$319 per kilowatt.

Both sides admit that the cost is high due to the fact that the plant must be built from

the very beginning, involving dam construction, acquisition of the land and construction of new buildings; and further, that the contemplated building was to be built large enough to house two 20,000 kilowatt generating units, although only one was to be installed at the present time.

Numerous examples were cited of other power plant installations in different parts of the United States indicating the size of installation and total completed cost. However, due to the fact that these plants represented merely extensions of the existing power plant, little could be concluded in a cost comparison analysis with our own proposed plant cost.

In conclusion, we, as a committee, feel that both sides are in agreement with the cost of \$319 per kilowatt, and that this per kilowatt cost is high.

Question 3. What is the anticipated revenue per year from the sale of electric power, assuming there is no change in user rates, if the proposed steam plant is built and put into use?

Question 4. A. What will be the yearly obligations of bonded indebtedness, consisting of principal and interest, of the electrical power division of the City Utilities, if the proposed steam plant is built and put into use? B. What will be the estimated operating expenses, depreciation, cost of supplemental power, other fixed charges, and any incidental expense of the electrical power division of the City Utilities, if the proposed steam plant is built and put into use?

NOTE.—Due to the fact that both of these questions are so interrelated, they have been answered together.

Answers to questions 3 and 4: In order to estimate the anticipated annual revenue from the sale of electric power if the proposed steam plant is built and put into use, it is necessary to determine two basic factors: First, we must have an estimate of the total number of kilowatt-hours which will be sold during some future year after the proposed steam plant has been put into operation. Second, we must determine at what average price each of these estimated kilowatt-hours will be sold during that future year.

We have selected the fiscal year ending March 31, 1954, as the year into which we will project our estimates. This year was chosen because it is the first full year during which the proposed steam plant could be in operation.

During the past 30 years the kilowatt-hours of electric power sold over this entire Nation have increased at an average annual rate of about 6½ percent, according to surveys published by the Federal Power Commission. During the past 4 years electric power sales of the City Utilities of Springfield, Mo., have increased annually, the rate of increase varying from about 7 percent to about 10 percent. However, a nationally known firm of engineers retained by the City Utilities estimated in 1947 that the rate of increase for Springfield during the next 15 years would approximate 4 to 5 percent.

Because the 6½-percent rate of increase represents the facts as compiled by the Federal Power Commission over a long period of time for the Nation as a whole and because this 6½-percent rate falls generally between the extremes of the 4- to 5-percent and the 7- to 10-percent estimates, this committee has based its study of the future power requirements of this city on an average annual rate of increase in kilowatt-hours sold of 6½ percent.

On the basis of this rate of increase, the 98,000,000-plus kilowatt-hours sold during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1949, would have grown to over 134,000,000 kilowatt-hours sold during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1954.

During the fiscal year ended March 31, 1949, the average price paid by consumers per kilo-

watt-hour was about 1 cent 9 mills. Had the 2-mill increase in user rates been in effect during the entire year, the average price per kilowatt-hour would have been just over 2 cents. Since we want to determine the anticipated annual revenue during 1953-54, assuming no change in present user rates, this is the average price which we have used.

During the year 1953-54, then, based on the assumptions which I have outlined, the estimated annual revenue from sale of electric power can be determined by multiplying the expected sales in kilowatt-hours, 134,000,000-plus, by the average user rate per kilowatt-hour, a little over 2 cents, for a total of about \$2,753,000.

In order to determine the probable results of operation, financially, should the proposed steam plant be built, it is necessary to estimate not only the annual revenue from electric-power sales but also the cost of producing this revenue.

The various elements of cost and expense which are expected to be incurred in the operation of the electric department of the City Utilities during 1953-54, together with the various facts and assumptions on which the projections are based, are, briefly, as follows:

1. Production costs: We must estimate the kilowatt-hours to be produced, and the cost of production per kilowatt-hour, in order to arrive at the annual cost production. Based on expected kilowatt-hour sales, as outlined previously, with allowances for nonrevenue energy and unaccounted for energy (in other words, energy which must be produced but is not sold), we have estimated that over 154,000,000 kilowatt-hours would be needed during 1953-54. Of this total, based on relative plant- and contracted-capacities, we estimate that about 110,000,000 kilowatt-hours would be produced in the new and old steam plants, and the balance, about 44,000,000, purchased under existing contracts. The average cost of production, assuming the use of coal for fuel 4 months of the year and gas the remaining 8 months, based on costs developed by the utilities' engineering consultants, should approximate less than 3½ mills at the new plant, and just over 5½ mills at the old plant. Extended on this basis, the cost of production during 1953-54 would approximate \$492,000.

2. Cost of power furnished for resale: We have previously estimated that about 44,000,000 kilowatt-hours would be purchased during 1953-54 under existing contracts. Based on the terms of these contracts, and assuming that this power is supplied us by our contract sources in the same proportion as that borne by the respective contract capacities, the cost of this purchased power would total about \$368,000.

3. Distribution expense, customer accounting and collection expense, sales promotion expense, and administration and general expense: Assuming the same average annual rate of increase or decrease in these expense items as that prevailing during the past 4 years, these expenses would total approximately \$264,000 during the year 1953-54.

4. Maintenance expense: Assuming that the level of maintenance expense for the old plant will remain about the same as in the year ended March 31, 1949, and that maintenance expenses for the proposed plant approximated \$1 per installed kilowatt, as recommended by the utilities' engineering consultants, maintenance would total about \$158,000 in the year 1953-54.

5. Depreciation: Again, assuming that depreciation of the old plant will remain the same as at present, and accepting the average life expectancy for the various components of the proposed steam plant as

recommended by the engineers, depreciation would total about \$875,000 during 1953-54.

6. Payments in lieu of taxes to city of Springfield: If the same average annual rate of increase prevails from now until 1954, as has been apparent during the past 4 years, these payments would total approximately \$94,000 in 1953-54.

The various elements of cost and expenses which I have just enumerated are referred to as operating revenue deductions, and come to about \$1,751,000. When this total is deducted from our anticipated revenue, it leaves a net operating revenue of approximately \$1,002,000. From this figure must be deducted the interest on the present and proposed bond issues, which we estimate will total about \$253,000, to arrive at the net income, for the year 1953-54, approximately \$749,000.

This net income, as estimated, is more than sufficient to provide for bond retirement payments into sinking funds, which payments we have estimated to total about \$405,000. The balance of net income after sinking fund payments would be available to provide better and more economical service to the citizens of Springfield.

Although such a comparison was not requested in our original questions, we have prepared a second projected statement of income, along the same lines as the study I have just discussed, in an attempt to estimate the results of operations during the year 1953-54 if the city utilities should not build the proposed steam plant, but instead contract with the Southwestern Power Administration for the additional 20,000 kilowatts.

Again, various assumptions had to be made. Basic among these assumptions was the ability or inability of the Southwestern Power Administration to deliver the needed electricity at that future time, and the reliability of the rates to be charged, as now published in "Interim Rate Schedule A."

Assuming that this power would be available to the city of Springfield during 1953-54 at the same rates as quoted in our present contract with Southwestern Power Administration, we develop an estimated "Net Operating Revenue" for that year of approximately \$1,022,000, which is about \$20,000 higher than the estimated "net operating revenue" should the new plant be built. "Net income," after deduction of estimated interest, on the present bond issue only, is estimated at about \$932,000. This figure, it should be noted, is about \$183,000 higher than our estimated "net income" on the basis of our other study, and is more than sufficient to provide for payments into sinking fund for retirement of the present bond issue. The balance of net income, after sinking fund payments, would again be available to provide better and more economical service to the citizens of Springfield.

In summary, let me emphasize the fact that any estimate of future happenings is necessarily based on various assumptions which are difficult, if not impossible, to prove conclusively in advance. This committee fully realizes the great possibility of error in making any projections into the unknown future. However, we believe that some attempt at forecasting the probable financial results of any proposed operating change is required by sound business-management policy. We have attempted to base our projections on assumptions which seem valid at this time; should future developments prove some of our estimates to be at variance with the facts as they are then apparent, the justification of our efforts must be found in the fact that, when drawn, our assumptions were the very best that our thinking could produce.

City utilities of Springfield, Mo.—Projected statement of income, electric department

	Assumptions	
	No. 1	No. 2
Operating revenue.....	\$2,753,000	\$2,753,000
Operating revenue deductions:		
Operating expense:		
Production.....	492,000	291,000
Power purchased for resale.....	368,000	735,000
Distribution.....	101,000	101,000
Customer accounting and collection.....	92,000	92,000
Sales promotion—net.....	1,000	1,000
Administrative and general.....	70,000	70,000
Maintenance.....	158,000	138,000
Depreciation.....	375,000	209,000
Payments in lieu of taxes to city.....	94,000	94,000
Total.....	1,751,000	1,731,000
Net operating revenue.....	1,002,000	1,022,000
Other deductions:		
Interest on revenue bonds, series A.....	90,000	90,000
Interest on proposed bond issue.....	163,000	-----
Total.....	253,000	90,000
Net income.....	749,000	932,000
Sinking fund requirements:		
Present bond issue.....	208,000	208,000
Proposed bond issue.....	197,000	-----
Total.....	405,000	208,000
Balance of net income.....	344,000	724,000

Assumption No. 1: 20,000 additional kilowatt demand supplied by proposed steam plant.

Assumption No. 2: 20,000 additional kilowatt demand supplied by contract with Southwestern Power Administration.

Question 6. What will be the estimated cost per kilowatt-hour to the city of Springfield (average normal usage) in 1953 for supplemental power from:

- A. Empire District Electric Co.,
- B. Bull Shoals Hydroelectric Power,
- C. Power from old and proposed new plants?

Answer. If we assume (for the sake of comparison) that the three given sources of power supply are equal with respect to adequacy and reliability, the selection should then be governed largely by simply a question of price.

First, let us consider the proposed new plant. Jim Matthews has just stated that the estimated cost of production of electrical power per kilowatt hour on the basis of present day fuel costs, would be approximately 6.32 mills.

It is our understanding that should a new plant be built it would be advisable to operate both plants. Therefore, our committee was anxious to know what the cost of generating power locally would be under these circumstances.

For this information we had the 1947 Burns and McDonnell report to work from and using the then prevailing 1947 price of fuels, the engineers estimated the total generating costs of the new plant, together with the continued operation of the old plant at 6.84 mills down to 6.11 mills, depending on the amount of power generated.

Our committee believes that with present day advanced fuel and labor costs, that by 1953 both combined plants would not be able to produce power any cheaper than these figures, and, therefore, we estimate the cost to be somewhere between 6 and 7 mills, de-

pending upon the amount of power produced.

EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC POWER

When we examine the cost of power from the Empire District Co., under the terms of our new contract, we have found that the average cost, based on average normal usage, will be around 6.73 in the future 10 years of the contract.

This committee is cognizant of the fact that in the Empire contract there is a clause giving the Empire Co. an opportunity to readjust their prices on the basis of exceedingly high fuel cost. But, we reason that any advance in their rates due to fuel advances would also affect cost of our own generated power.

BULL SHOALS POWER

When we consider power from Bull Shoals Dam, here again we must realize that the rate is subject to revision by the Federal Power Commission if further study and experience indicate the desirability of such revision; however, for the purpose of comparison, we are assuming that further rates will remain comparable to present rates.

Last October 17, Mr. Doug. Wright, who is the administrator for the Southwestern Power Administration, made a talk before the chamber of commerce about this source of power and their rates. He said, and we quote:

"The average use per month is 350 to 400 kilowatt hours and that means a rate of 5.5 mills to 5.6 mills. If you use the energy almost constantly the rate could go down to 4.75 mills."

All of our findings prove this to be exactly correct.

CONCLUSIONS

Our conclusions on this question are then as follows:

Our conclusions on this question are then as follows:
First. That the cheapest source of supplemental power in 1953 will be from Bull Shoals at the rate of from 5.5 mills down to 4.75 mills.

Second. That the highest cost of power will be from the Empire District Electric Co. at a rate of 6.73 mills.

Third. That power generated from the proposed steam plant in conjunction with our present plant would cost us between 6 and 7 mills.

Question 7. At this time, what amount of power can be made available to Springfield for use in 1953—a and b?

Answer. I will answer the a and b together by first observing that if the new plant is built, we will have 20,000 kilowatts per day more available than we will have available if we don't build the new plant.

In addition to the above, or, if you will, exclusive of the above, we will have 17,500 kilowatts available from our present plant. This plant will, no doubt, remain operative for some time; but it is admittedly old, and maintenance costs cannot be expected to ever be reduced on it.

Springfield Utilities has a new contract with Empire District Electric calling for a minimum of 5,000 kilowatts daily and providing for whatever additional power we may require. This contract runs for 10 years and would seem to fully alleviate the fear of insufficient power for that period. Cost of producing our own power with the proposed new plant; however, would be expected to be more economical than purchasing all our needs from Empire, and, of course, we would have to make another deal in 10 years.

The Southwest Power Administration has contracted to furnish Springfield another 10,000 kilowatts daily, starting in 1953 upon the completion of provision for transporting the power to Springfield, at a rate that appears favorable in light of our own costs. Additional amounts of such power, however, could be contracted for. The other consideration in this source of power would seem

to be that in contracting for such additional amounts of power in advance of actual need, we will have to pay demand charges in advance of actual requirements. Springfield, as a municipally owned power plant, is a preferred customer of SPA and shares this preference with the REA's who also are taking much of the SPA power. There is a more secure feeling in our minds at least, about obtaining power from a self-owned source than about obtaining it from proposed sources subject to changing legislation; but the attractive rates offered by SPA, plus the fact that some power is definitely available for present contract, makes it a source worthy of consideration.

To conclude upon the availability of power to Springfield in 1953, you can see that we have, without the new plant, 17,500 kilowatts of our own make, 5,000 kilowatts from Empire, and 10,000 kilowatts from SPA. This equals 32,500 kilowatts daily minimum with as much more as required from Empire contracted for, and additional from SPA at present, at least, available. This should more than cover our needs. So, as we see the matter, the question is more one of reliability and economy than supply.

Question 8. What amount of firm power will be needed for the City of Springfield in the year 1953?

Answer. The first step for us to determine approximately was how much the peak load would be in 1953. This has been relatively simple to do, because from all of our sources we find they point closely to the same figure. Therefore, we believe that in 1953 our peak demand will be between 30,000 kilowatts and 35,000 kilowatts. For a close estimate we are using a figure of 32,500.

We feel that we should go one step further and point out that this figure is by coincidence the same as the combined total of our power now contracted for and produced in our local plant; that is, 10,000 kilowatts from Bull Shoals for 20 years, plus 5,000 kilowatts minimum with Empire District Electric for 10 years, plus 17,500 which we produce in our present plant exactly total the estimate for peak demand in 1953.

We believe that it is the obligation of this committee to make note of the fact that from 1953 to 1963 we will have to have an additional amount of power over and above this peak load of 32,500 in 1953 to meet the increasing loads of this 10-year period. It is pointed out that provision will have to be made for obtaining this additional power from one of the three sources which have been discussed.

SUMMARY

In a brief summary of the answers arrived at by our committee, we find the following conclusions:

1. That the latest estimated cost of construction of a new steam plant to the citizens of Springfield would be \$6,380,000.

2. That the cost per kilowatt of the proposed plant is \$319 per kilowatt, and that cost is admittedly high.

3 and 4. That by building the proposed plant our electric department of the City Utilities could show a net profit for the year ending March 31, 1954, or \$344,000, but by not building the plant it could show a net profit of \$724,000, with rates remaining at what they are.

5 and 6. That our cheapest source of power will be from Bull Shoals, our next cheapest would be from combined operation of the old and new plants in Springfield, and that the most expensive will be from the Empire Electric Co.

7 and 8. By building the new plant, using the old plant, and using the 10,000 kilowatts from Bull Shoals, and the 5,000 kilowatts from Empire, which we must pay a demand charge for whether we use it or not, we would have available 52,500 kilowatts for usage, without additional contracts. If we do not build a new plant, we would have available

32,500 kilowatts. Our requirements for 1953 will be 32,500 kilowatts.

On viewing the above answers, it would seem that there could be but one conclusion, and that is, that on a strict basis of costs to the utility users, that the new steam plant should not be built. However, there are many other factors that should be considered. First, that our present steam plant is old, and its age is reflected by its rising maintenance costs. It must also be replaced eventually. Second, would power from Bull Shoals or Empire be as reliable as power from our own steam plant? Third, building a new steam plant in Springfield would involve the spending in Springfield of over \$2,000,000, and that the labor employed on the project and in the new plant would be Springfield labor. Fourth, that the new lake for the power plant would provide a fine recreation area for Springfield, and other factors are present.

However, the committee feels that to build the new steam plant would not alleviate any present power shortage. There is no immediate crisis. Our present contract with Empire runs until 1959, and our contract with SPA runs for 20 years. In 1956, or possibly sooner, this issue will be a crisis, and we should be prepared to meet it. The utilities board and every responsible citizen should keep this problem in mind. Some time in the near future construction costs may be reduced, or the SPA will be able to offer service to us over an integrated network of transmission lines, or some other important factor may develop which would change the picture. However, at this date, we cannot say that the voters of Springfield made a mistake when they voted against the new plant. In the words of Douglas Wright, "The voters could have decided either way without making a technical error."

We sincerely hope that the many hours which our committee has devoted to this question have been of some benefit to the people of our community. We believe that this problem is one to be decided by the people. If our city is to grow and prosper, the people in it must be constantly aware of their civic responsibilities, and should have an interest in their city's problems. If our efforts have done nothing more than stimulate that interest, we, of our committee feel that our efforts have been amply rewarded.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I should also like to commend to the Senate a letter from Mayor Otis L. Barbarick, in which he discusses the great concern of the community for securing adequate electric energy at reasonable prices. Mayor Barbarick states:

In behalf of the people of our city and of our trade territory, I would like to say that we would greatly appreciate your giving due consideration to this matter and your assisting us in any way you can to bring about the completion of these lines and other facilities which might give us the opportunity to be served by hydroelectric power.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter from Mayor Barbarick be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF SPRINGFIELD,
Springfield, Mo., May 18, 1951.

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear SENATOR: I have just had a visit with our mutual friend, Mr. Leonard Chinn, who has just returned from Washington. He advised me that he discussed with you a problem which is of great concern to our commu-

nity and to the city of Springfield, that of having adequate electric energy at the right price. I want to assure you that the council of our city, as well as the writer, would be greatly pleased if you would use your influence in helping us accomplish that end.

There will be a hearing before a Senate committee, which, I am sure, Mr. Chinn discussed with you, dealing with the allocation of money for use in the construction by SPA of lines and substations, and if this legislation is passed, it will have to have strong support and leadership in the Senate. In behalf of the people of our city and of our trade territory, I would like to say that we would greatly appreciate your giving due consideration to this matter and your assisting us in any way you can to bring about the completion of these lines and other facilities which might give us the opportunity to be served by hydroelectric power.

I want to thank you in advance for your assistance in this matter. I would also like to thank you for the courtesies extended to our mutual friend, Mr. Chinn, and for any courtesies which you may extend to any of our council members or official family or citizens of our city.

With kindest regards, I am

Yours very truly,

OTIS L. BARBARICK,
Mayor.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I further direct to the attention of the Members of the Senate a letter from Mr. M. D. Lightfoot, chairman of the Citizens Committee of Springfield, representing 14,000 citizens, protesting the withholding of Southwestern Power Administration funds needed to complete the facilities for the delivery of power to the Springfield area. I ask that the letter from Mr. Lightfoot be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPRINGFIELD, Mo., May 14, 1951.
Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Our citizens committee, more than 14,000 strong, herewith desires to enter the strongest protest possible because of the withholding of Southwestern Power Administration funds to complete the facilities for the delivery of power to Springfield and this territory.

There is a shortage of prime power and the present monopoly costs for power are most burdensome. Springfield and the entire territory simply are "paying through the nose."

March 31, 1949, the United States of America signed a contract with Springfield, Mo., to deliver 10,000 kilowatts per day. In addition other contracts have been signed with REA groups. Are we now to see our Government, through its Congress, repudiate those contracts? Are we just to consider them as another scrap of paper?

Approximately \$100,000,000 of Federal funds has been spent developing the Bull Shoals area, designed to give power relief for this Ozark Commonwealth territory. Now, with but around \$500,000 additional required to complete partly constructed installations, western Missouri, of all this midwestern territory has been singled out for rank and unjust discrimination. We submit that this is too great a price to pay simply to preserve the monopoly of an untility that has this territory firmly in its grip.

Senator, we earnestly petition you to aid and forward our cause with the full power of your ability.

We ask you to file this letter with your senatorial committee as the expressed will of many thousands in requesting that this

embargo placed on us by the lower House of Congress, be removed.

Very truly yours,

THE CITIZENS COMMITTEE,
By M. D. LIGHTFOOT, Chairman.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, at this point I would like to have printed in the RECORD a wire I have received from Mr. John K. Hulston, president of the Springfield Chamber of Commerce, in which it says:

The city officials of Springfield, its citizenry and all civic organizations respectfully pray for your earnest and effective influence to do the needful.

I ask unanimous consent that the telegram from Mr. Hulston be printed in the RECORD in full.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPRINGFIELD, Mo., June 20, 1951.
Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

If the so-called Short amendment is not eliminated and funds restored for SWPA, this very important segment of the State you represent will be seriously handicapped. Why should we be made noncompetitive for industry when we have in our backyard resources that entitle us to be out in front. You are intelligent enough to recognize that claims of hardship by privately owned utilities are not borne out by net-net earnings after all taxes paid. The city officials of Springfield, its citizenry, and all civic organizations respectfully pray for your earnest and effective influence to do the needful.

SPRINGFIELD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
JOHN K. HULSTON, President.
L. E. MEADOR,
Chairman, River Projects Committee.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I should also like to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement of the Board of Public Utilities of the City of Springfield, Mo., in support of the proposed program of the Southwestern Power Administration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF BOARD OF PUBLIC UTILITIES OF CITY OF SPRINGFIELD, MO., IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED PROGRAM OF SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

In March 1945 the city of Springfield, Mo., purchased the electric, gas, steam-heating, and bus-transportation utilities serving said city and the suburban territory adjacent thereto, which has a population of some 90,000 persons. All of said municipally owned utilities are operated by a board of public utilities, consisting of six businessmen appointed by the city council.

The municipally owned electric system has experienced a continuous and rapid growth since acquisition by the city in March 1945. The number of customers served by the electric system has increased from 22,148 in 1945 to 29,522 at the present time, and the peak system demand has risen from approximately 18,100 kilowatts in 1945 to 27,080 kilowatts now. The city of Springfield has experienced a steady, continuous, and uninterrupted growth for many years, and similar growth and development are anticipated in the future.

To supply the electric power required by the city's distribution system, the board of public utilities has no generating capacity or source, other than a steam-power plant which has a firm generating capacity of 12,-

000 kilowatts. The remainder of the city's power requirements must be obtained by purchase from high voltage transmission lines.

At the present time, all of the wholesale power required by the city, in excess of that generated at the city's steam-power plant, is being purchased from Empire District Electric Co., a private utility with headquarters at Joplin, Mo., under a wholesale power contract which became effective on June 1, 1950. By that contract, the demand charge was raised from \$1.40 to \$1.95 per kilowatt, the energy charge for "on-peak energy" was raised from 4½ to 5 mills per kilowatt-hour, the period during which so-called off-peak energy might be taken was shortened materially, and an onerous and burdensome fuel adjustment clause was included in the rate schedule. All of this has increased materially the cost of power purchased from Empire District. For example, the average cost of purchased power from Empire District during the month of April 1951, under the present wholesale power contract was 10.07 mills per kilowatt-hour, as contrasted with an average cost of 6.7 mills per kilowatt-hour during April 1950, under the previous contract. The city of Springfield is not, and never has been, satisfied with the rate schedule in the present contract with Empire District Electric Co.; but, having no other outside source of power, the city has been compelled, from a practical standpoint, to purchase from Empire District on the best available rate, whatever that might be.

For many years, Springfield has supported and urged construction by the Federal Government of hydroelectric generating facilities in the White River basin, which would enable the city to obtain power from that source. Under date of March 21, 1949, Springfield entered into a wholesale power agreement with the Federal Government, acting through the administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration, under which the Government agreed to sell and deliver to Springfield 10,000 kilowatts of power and such accompanying energy as Springfield might require, said contract being designated as Contract Ispa-256. However, electric service under that contract has not become available, and could not become available, unless and until high voltage transmission lines from Bull Shoals Dam to Springfield and adequate substation facilities at or near Springfield are constructed. By virtue of the so-called Short amendment in the House of Representatives, Southwestern Power Administration could not proceed with construction of these urgently needed transmission and substation facilities during the ensuing fiscal year, and the date, on which Springfield might hope to receive power from Bull Shoals Dam, would be postponed and delayed indefinitely.

The city of Springfield, its board of public utilities, and the city's 29,522 electric consumers have a vital interest in that portion of the program of Southwestern Power Administration which contemplates construction of high voltage transmission lines from Bull Shoals Dam to Springfield and erection of a substation at Springfield for delivery of electric power to the city's distribution system. The conditions and rate schedule under which wholesale power presently is purchased from the only available outside source, i. e., Empire District Electric Co., are neither favorable nor satisfactory from the city's standpoint. Accordingly, representatives of the city and its board of public utilities are appearing before this subcommittee in support of the program of Southwestern Power Administration and in order that this subcommittee may be informed of the interest of the city and its electric consumers in obtaining power from Bull Shoals Dam. It is earnestly hoped that the Congress may see fit

to provide without further delay adequate and sufficient funds for construction of proposed high voltage transmission lines from Bull Shoals Dam to Springfield and a substation at Springfield, and to remove any crippling limitations, restrictions or prohibitions upon Southwestern Power Administration with respect to construction, operation, and maintenance of such transmission and substation facilities which are so urgently needed to supply power to Springfield.

Respectfully submitted.

BOARD OF PUBLIC UTILITIES OF CITY
OF SPRINGFIELD, Mo.

By CHARLES L. CHALENDER, *Secretary*.

Mr. HENNINGS. And finally, Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum drawn up by Mr. C. Sprong, general manager of the City Utilities of Springfield. This memorandum covers every angle of both the Southwestern Power Administration's contracts and the Empire District Electric Co. contract, and presents the facts about the operation of Springfield's small low pressure steam generating plant. The statement concludes:

The furnishing of electric energy to the City of Springfield, Missouri, and vicinity is a matter of vital interest to the Board of Public Utilities and every citizen. The lowest cost would be under service from Southwestern Power Administration transmission lines and from the Government dams. The Board of Public Utilities requests earnest consideration by all Senators for the approval of the necessary appropriation to the Southwestern Power Administration.

The memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THE POWER SITUATION IN SPRINGFIELD, Mo.

The city of Springfield, Mo., a municipal corporation, owns and operates its own utilities, electric, gas, steam and transportation, through a Board of Public Utilities consisting of six prominent businessmen.

The electric utility through 29,375 meters, as of May 31, 1951, is serving the citizens of Springfield and immediate vicinity approximately 11 miles from the city limits in all directions. This territory has a population including rural customers and small settlements of about 90,000 people.

The low pressure steam generating plant operated by the utility has an installed capacity of approximately 24,500 kilowatts consisting of 3 turbines, one of 5,000 kilowatts, one of 7,000 kilowatts and one of 12,500 kilowatt rated capacity. This means that the firm generating capacity in case the largest turbine was out of commission for any cause would be only 12,000 kilowatts.

These turbines are capable of generating for resale between 19,000 and 20,000 kilowatts. The present peak load is 27,800 kilowatts which is far above the generating capacity of the plant. The average cost in this plant for the year ending May 31, 1951, was 6.74 mills per kilowatt-hour. During this period there was a net generation in the plant of 72,905,690 kilowatt-hours.

Because of this limited generating capacity it is necessary for the utility to purchase the additional needed electric energy. To receive this purchased power there is at present installed on the distribution system two substations, one of 7,000 kilovolt-amperes and the other of 15,000 kilovolt-amperes capacity or 22,000 in all. Another 15,000 kilovolt-ampere capacity substation is now on order and will be installed early in 1953.

At present the only physical connection the system has is with the Empire District Electric Co. of Joplin, Missouri, a private

owned utility which operates both hydro electric and steam generating plants. A 10-year contract for electric energy to be purchased from that company was put into effect June 1, 1950. This contract stipulates that the Empire Co. will on demand furnish all the requirements of the utility over and above the firm generating capacity of 12,000 kilowatts in the utility steam plant.

Under terms of the existing contract the utility must pay a demand charge of \$1.95 for each kilowatt of billing demand during "on peak" hours each month. Also an energy charge of 5 mills per kilowatt-hour during "peak hours" and 3 mills per kilowatt-hour during "off peak hours." In addition there is a very onerous fuel adjustment clause based on a variation from 10½ cents per million British thermal units of the average cost of fuel. As no fuel can now be purchased for that cost this adjustment clause has increased materially the cost to the utility of all energy purchased. Every effort was made to reduce these exorbitant charges at the time the contract was made but the Empire Co. refused to lower any of the terms of the contract. As there was no other means of securing power the Board of Public Utilities was placed in a position where signing such a contract was necessary.

The cost of purchased power to the utility during the year ending May 31, 1951, was an average of 8.57 mills per kilowatt-hour. During this period there was purchased 58,325,700 kilowatt-hours. The fuel adjustment clause caused the utility cost to rise sharply since November 1950. Since that time the average cost has been 10.23 mills per kilowatt-hour. In the month of May 1951, the cost was 12.05 mills.

The representatives of the Empire Co. have testified before the House and Senate committees that these are reasonable rates but this utility does not agree. While it is true that the Empire Co. can furnish all the power the utility can receive the cost is prohibitive.

The utility has contracted with the Southwestern Power Administration for 10,000 kilowatts. Until there is some means of bringing electric energy from the Government dams the utility cannot receive any power through this source. Under this contract the utility will pay the Southwestern Power Administration 1.35 per kilowatt of billing demand for which it would receive free 200 kilowatt-hours per kilowatt per month. Any additional energy would cost 4 mills per kilowatt-hour. The maximum cost to the utility under the present schedule "A" rates would be 6.75 per kilowatt-hour. Under the use of this demand the cost can be reduced for 600 hours use to 4.917 mills per kilowatt-hour. This would constitute approximately 60 percent of the utility requirements. In the month of May 1951 the total energy generated and purchased was 11,233,910 kilowatt-hours of which only 3,706,200 kilowatt-hours was purchased from the private company account of high rates and costs.

The conclusion arrived at by these facts show that costs to the utility are as follows:

	Mills per kilowatt-hour
Owners power plant.....	6.74
Empire District Electric Co., after November 1950.....	10.23
Southwestern Power Administration under proposed service under Government power contract.....	4.917

Under rates quoted heretofore this utility paid to Empire District Electric Co. for period June 1, 1950, to May 31, 1951, on purchase of 58,325,700 kilowatt-hours the sum of \$499,433.81.

If the same amount had been purchased under schedule "A" rates of Southwestern Power Administration the cost would have been \$305,792.80.

This would have resulted in a saving of \$193,641.01 to the City Utilities of Springfield, Mo.

The furnishing of electric energy to the city of Springfield, Mo., and vicinity is a matter of vital interest to the board of public utilities and every citizen. The lowest costs would be under service from Southwestern Power Administration transmission lines from the Government dams. The board of public utilities requests earnest consideration by all Senators for approval of the necessary appropriation to the Southwestern Power Administration.

C. SPRONG,
General Manager.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment previously passed over will be stated.

The next amendment passed over was, under the heading "Bureau of Land Management—Management of lands and resources," on page 8, line 10, after the word "Management", to strike out "\$6,900,000, of which \$1,200,000 shall be used for soil and moisture conservation", and insert "\$7,722,605, of which not to exceed \$4,864,096 shall be available for personal services."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified by the marking "7/6/51—N," and offer it to this committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 8, in line 12, it is proposed to strike out "\$7,722,605" and insert "\$7,484,301".

On page 8, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "\$4,864,096" and insert "\$4,824,692."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the proposed amendment relates to page 8, line 12. It would strike out "\$7,722,605" and insert "\$7,484,301." It relates to "Management of lands and resources, Bureau of Land Management."

On page 8, in line 12, my amendment would also reduce the amount which can be used for payroll or personal services from "\$4,864,096" to "\$4,824,692."

As I have said, Mr. President, this is an amendment to the appropriation for "Management of Lands and Resources," under the Bureau of Land Management. The simple purpose of the amendment is to make the action of the Committee on Appropriations on this item consistent with its approach on other items in the bill.

Mr. President, the rule of thumb of the committee was to apply a reduction of 10 percent to the budget estimates for personal services, exempting operation and maintenance personnel from the reduction. In other words, there was to be a 10-percent cut, but there were exemptions of operation and maintenance personnel from the 10-percent reduction.

I must say that I was not at all satisfied with the approach of the committee, and raised this question before the com-

mittee, not that I disapproved the 10-percent-reduction formula, because I believe that such a formula is a prerequisite to any economy effort the Congress may make toward the assertion of congressional control over the mushrooming of Federal payrolls, which are now at an all-time record height. In other words, I believe a great step forward has been taken in imposing a limitation of 10 percent, plus the further fact that there is a limitation on the amount which can be used for payrolls. The proposal before the Committee on Appropriations was without personal service limitations, such as were in the original bill coming from the House. It would include such items as travel, telephone, rent, and various other expenditures which, if the Administrator desired, he could use at any time for the personnel payroll.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Does this item involve publicity activities on the part of the Department?

Mr. FERGUSON. The question of publicity is involved in every item relating to personnel. There is no way for Congress to keep a constant check on the question of public relations, what is sometimes called education, or what is called by others propaganda, which is merely publicity. At times not only is the Administrator interested in publicity, as we hear constantly over the radio, but in the question which constantly arises in regard to lawyers, economists, planners, and many of the stenographers and clerks employed in connection with the program of public relations.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to answer the Senator from Kansas, but I cannot answer him directly, because there is no way of telling how much of this money is being used for public relations. There is a statute which prohibits the use of any money for propaganda purposes, either for or against legislation; but I think the statute is "more honored in the breach than the observance." It is continually breached.

This bill now contains a limitation allowing but 75 percent of the sum which was requested for public relations; but, as I say, we cannot limit it in that way. It is only an attempt to limit it. When the administration wants to issue propaganda, it uses every employee and every means of doing so; and it is not under the head of public relations.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. That was one of the points I wanted to be sure to have brought out; that is, how this activity, in fact, is being handled, in view of the specific statute against the use of public funds in furtherance of or in opposition to measures pending before the Congress. I was wondering whether, in connection with the reductions proposed

by the amendments, the bill specifically pinpoints and takes care of that phase of activities on the part of certain of the departments, and particularly of this one, at this time.

Mr. FERGUSON. We are trying to take care of it. Under the Byrd amendment, in which the Senator from Michigan and certain other Senators joined, an attempt was made to limit the amount which could be used; but we are continually facing the impossibility of limiting propaganda. Let us say that, today, one of the administrators delivers a speech by radio or television, regarding land management, or that he makes a trip to the West for that purpose. How many people are brought into play in the writing of the speech, or in obtaining the necessary data? There is simply no way of saying, and there is no limitation which can be placed upon an item of that particular kind.

Mr. President, what I proposed was that the committee substitute a rule-of-thumb formula for other reductions which it was possible to make. In doing so, the 10-percent rule has actually backfired on us, in view of the fact that we are shut off from the elementary reductions to which the committee should first look, before going to the personal-service cut.

I was also compelled to take into consideration the rather broad exemption for operation and maintenance personnel, which was voted by the committee, under the 10-percent rule. Exemptions started as a means of protecting vital hospital and medical services. In other words, when we first took up on the floor of the Senate the 10-percent amendment, and, in fact, when it was first taken up in committee, the question came up as to exempting all hospital attendants and medical services in hospitals, and it seemed reasonable, as it now seems reasonable, that while such personnel, if not needed, can be cut off, yet, if they are needed, we cannot reduce a service of that kind.

As I said, I have no objection to extending the exemption to law-enforcement personnel, or to such safety activities as the forest firefighters; but we are going rather far afield when we make blanket exemptions for everyone who is placed in the category of operation or maintenance. In effect, we are almost saying that all Federal personnel in the field shall be exempt from reduction.

I am merely inviting the attention of the Senate to what has been done. In this case, the committee actually reversed itself in its application of even the 10-percent rule, with exceptions. There were nine programs carried on under this appropriation title. The committee applied the 10-percent rule on seven out of the nine, and exempted Soil and Moisture Conservation and Forest Management. Those two items were exempted entirely. As a matter of fact, the Soil and Conservation Agency was provided with an earmarked sum of \$198,900 above the budget estimate. The House likewise provided an earmarked sum for this program which was above the budget estimate, but the House did not raise the appropriation as a whole to include the

earmarked fund. In other words, the House earmarked the sum of \$198,900, but did not raise the total appropriation to cover the earmarked portion. The Senate committee not only earmarked the sum, but provided an excess sum of \$198,900 to cover the portion that was earmarked. In so doing, it did not apply the 10-percent cut on the excess. In other words, by this action it exempted the full \$198,000 for the program of soil and moisture conservation. It also granted to the Forest Management personnel an exemption from the application of the 10-percent-reduction rule, which amounted to \$39,404. The justification for this exemption was the belief that additional revenue would be provided.

In other words, Mr. President, we find at times that there is a claim that we should not cut a particular item because revenue is derived from the work being done by the personnel. That is not always a safe rule to follow. The question is whether the extra employees are needed for that particular line of work, whether it can be done without them because the Nation faces a great emergency. As the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the chairman of the Finance Committee, has indicated, we must find a way of cutting the budget by approximately \$6,000,000,000.

I receive letters from time to time with reference to questions of economy, and I find that the complaint usually is not that we are cutting too much, but that we are cutting too little. All I am doing in this particular case is asking to cut \$238,304 from an appropriation which carries more than \$7,000,000. I do not blame the public for saying that the amount to be taken off is too small. We are never going to cut \$6,000,000,000 from the budget by any such reductions. But the Senator from Michigan feels that when we apply the rule of a 10-percent cut we should not exempt two of the particular items covered by the rule, nor should we increase the appropriation when we earmark \$198,900 above the budget estimate and do not take even 10 percent out of that appropriation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am quite surprised at the statement of the distinguished Senator that he has been unable to find out the amount of money being spent for propaganda, and also that he is unable to stop that procedure. Is not my distinguished friend a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I am not a member of that committee.

Mr. LANGER. Was the Senator lately a member of it?

Mr. FERGUSON. I was a member of it approximately 2 years ago.

Mr. LANGER. Does the distinguished Senator know that there is nothing to prevent the committee from calling in the head of any department?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. For example, we find various heads of departments writing

books and selling them, some of them receiving high prices.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; and using Government material and Government help to write the books.

Mr. LANGER. That is exactly correct. There is nothing to stop the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments from calling in one of these authors and finding out to whom he dictated the book, and whether Government supplies and help were used.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. So, as a matter of fact, the Senator was perhaps in error when he said there was no way to stop the practice, when the committee to which I have referred has ample power.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota, who has pointed out that a research job could be done. In 1946 I undertook to make that kind of a survey, and I discovered that there were assigned to a certain executive officer 1,080 full-time and part-time propaganda agents. The work was being done in the name of education, and different things. I discovered that \$74,000,000 was being used for the purpose of education. When we consider what is used for propaganda purposes, I wish we could find the telegrams that went out urging people to get in touch with their Representatives and Senators. With reference to a cut even so small as the one now proposed, we would find that telegrams have been sent out by the agency affected. I say it is a physical impossibility to solve the problem as to how much propaganda actually goes out.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. In view of the statement made by the Senator from Michigan that he found that \$74,000,000 was being used for propaganda purposes by the departments in 1946, I am curious to know what he did about it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I tried to do something. I proposed from time to time cutting their budgets. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who worked on the matter in 1946, collected many books and pamphlets. I wish he would tell us how many he did collect. They were piled up in an office which the Senator from Michigan was occupying in the Capitol, and we could hardly get into the office because of the pile of books and propaganda issued by various departments. We exposed that fact. The Senator from New Hampshire has made several speeches on the floor with reference to this item, and he has endeavored, as the senior member of the Appropriations Committee on the minority side, to get at this evil, on every possible occasion, and make reductions in such appropriations.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I say say to the Senator from North Dakota that we knew

this practice was indulged in, and we communicated with each executive department of the Government of the United States, asking to be furnished with one copy each of the booklets which had been printed for publication and general distribution in the previous fiscal year. In other words, we did not ask for booklets of the Agriculture Extension Service which might be sent to their own workers, nor did we ask for communications between departments. We asked only for one copy each of the pamphlets and booklets which had been prepared for public distribution. They totaled 82,343 in number.

As the distinguished Senator from Michigan has stated, he had assigned to him an office in the basement of the Capitol, and the documents were placed in that office. They occupied that large room pretty nearly halfway to the ceiling. We brought out the facts and took steps, insofar as we could, to alert Congress to what was going on. Very shortly after that the Republicans lost control of the Congress of the United States, and the work which we had been doing had no continuity of action and follow-up. We were in the minority then, but we did establish the facts as to what was going on, and, as the Senator knows, we did reduce certain appropriations for strictly publicity work during 1948, when some of this information was available.

That effort has not been followed up as the Senator from New Hampshire would like to see it followed up, and, as the Senator from North Dakota has suggested, a proper committee of the Senate, which has the time to do such work, could call in the representatives of various departments, department by department, and follow the thing through. The trouble is, as the Senator knows, that Senators are completely swamped with work. If a Senator were three different persons instead of only one, he then would not have half the time to do what he is called upon to do. But the basis has been established for such a study. Action is needed. I concur with the distinguished Senator from Michigan in all that he has stated. I wish to associate myself with him in supporting his amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to answer the Senator from North Dakota, because he has asked a question, the answer to which everyone wishes to know, What has been done about the matter?

Mr. LANGER. That is exactly right.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the question that must be answered. There is no use of obtaining information concerning an evil unless some action is taken to correct it.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from Michigan will remember, as I do, that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire came before the Senate on two different occasions and delivered magnificent speeches on the subject. He had pamphlets with him, and he explained what they were, and told us how absurd the situations were. But I have never found out what was done to remedy those situations. I should like to have

the Senator from Michigan tell me what was done.

Mr. FERGUSON. Because of those situations we have arrived at the culmination represented by the committee amendment which is section 301 of the bill, as it appears on page 46.

No part of the money appropriated by this act—

That is, no part of the appropriation contained in this bill—

or made available for expenditure by the Virgin Islands Corporation which is in excess of 75 percent of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by the Department of the Interior or the Virgin Islands Corporation during such fiscal year in the performance of—

(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material,

shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2).

In other words, what we have attempted to do by that amendment is to allow only 75 percent of the budget estimate. The Senator is now going to ask the question, "Why did you allow anything?"

Mr. LANGER. Yes, surely.

Mr. FERGUSON. The answer to that is that the Senators who sponsored that committee amendment, which would allow 75 percent of the budget estimate, after surveying the situation came to the conclusion that if we made the cut any deeper, if we cut down into the nerve center of propaganda any deeper, we could not get such a cut approved by the Senate. What we wanted to do was at least to make a start with a cut of 25 percent this year, and after having made such a start we felt that perhaps next year we could cut off even 50 percent, and perhaps the time will come when we can cut out all the nerve centers we find in this propaganda machine.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I notice in lines 12 and 13 on page 47 the language "disseminating public information." The Senator from North Dakota is interested in knowing why there was not included in the amendment the elimination of books which heads of departments and agencies frequently write, and sell to magazines, or which on many occasions are submitted to some editor who publishes them by the hundreds of thousands.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should think that such matters would be covered by the provision which I read to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. But such a book would be a private book.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator says it would be a private book. Of course, the one who writes it is not always paid for it. But what he is doing is neglecting his Government work while he is writing his memoirs or someone else's memoirs, and employing in that activity Government personnel and making use of research departments of various Government agencies, and so forth, perhaps for personal gain.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no doubt that that is true.

Mr. LANGER. But such a book is not included?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would say that it is not included. I do not see how such a limitation could be placed in the bill. The one writing such a book may claim he is writing it at night, and that no part of the money contained in the bill is being paid out for such purposes.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Is not the Senator from Michigan sure that by the proposed reduction of 25 percent which he is attempting to make—and it is most commendable—he is not crippling legitimate operations of any of the departments, but only attempting to reduce, by 25 percent, appropriations for such purposes as he has mentioned.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. And is the Senator not sure that the proposed action cannot be honestly and fairly criticized from the standpoint that it will result in crippling the work of a department?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. If an agency is honest in dealing with propaganda such as the Senator from North Dakota has referred to, such as the writing of a private book which the writer proposes to sell, the agency will come to Congress and tell how much of the appropriation is to be used for such propaganda.

Mr. Eric Johnston indicated when the Senate was debating the defense production measure, particularly the matter of price controls, which is now being debated in the House, that his agency was going to send out information on the subject. The radio has been used for that purpose day in and day out. Messages have gone to the press containing statements as to how the economy of the country will be ruined unless Congress follows a program recommended by his agency; even saying that it will result in an additional cost of a dollar a day to each family in the United States if the program is not adopted.

Where does the information come from? It comes from that particular agency. It is using its power today to bring to the public all such information. Certainly the agency can present all the information necessary on the subject with the use of 75 percent of its present personnel. The agency can well cut 25 percent of its personnel and still send out propaganda information, which is

not essential to the operation of the Government.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand the Senator's amendment is directed only to cutting down the propaganda activities of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. FERGUSON. No. We have gotten away from a discussion of the amendment that is before the Senate, and I have been answering a question asked by the Senator from North Dakota as to whether the purpose of the amendment was to cut down the amount of propaganda.

Mr. WATKINS. I am very much in favor of cutting down the propaganda. What I refer to is whether the Senator's amendment will cut off activities of the agencies which lease oil lands and other mineral lands owned by the Government throughout the Mountain States. Is the Senator proposing to cut down the personnel in the offices dealing with such matters?

Mr. FERGUSON. The committee has already made a 10-percent cut in the items the Senator has mentioned, excepting operations and maintenance personnel. That cut has already been made pursuant to the expressed sentiment of the Senate in connection with earlier bills. My amendment would restore the budget figures as a basis for the 10-percent cut instead of allowing the excess over the budget represented by the earmarking of funds for soil and moisture conservation, and it would deny a special exemption from the 10-percent cut for the benefit of forest management, which the committee had allowed contrary to its basic formula.

Mr. WATKINS. Would the Senator's amendment cut anything from the Bureau of Land Management?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. That is what I am trying to find out.

Mr. FERGUSON. This is under the heading "Bureau of Land Management: Management of Lands and Resources."

Mr. WATKINS. If the cut is to be directed at the leasing activities in the land offices in the West, where leases are taken care of, it strikes me that it is a very poor business move. Take the Salt Lake City Land Office, where stacks of lease applications are on file. For years they have been asking for enough help so that they can handle those leases. We need oil in this country. The delay in the land office there has discouraged many applicants who would otherwise go forth and drill for oil.

Utah is being discovered and developed as an oil field. I have been beseeched time and again by business interests to get that activity going, so that oil leases may be made. If oil leases are made, a large income will accrue directly to the United States. I call attention to the fact that through leasing operations alone last year more than \$35,000,000 was brought into the public treasury, as against a very small outlay for that activity on the part of the Government. That income will increase 10-fold in Salt

Lake City if we can get those leases acted upon. Some of them have been held up for 2 or 3 years.

Mr. FERGUSON. For leases and disposal of land and mineral resources, the amount asked for by the Budget Bureau was \$942,500. The House cut it to \$375,000. The Senate Appropriations Committee reduced the personnel by 10 percent. However, that would not prevent the agency which was spending the entire amount, which is \$7,722,605, from properly handling the leasing and disposal of mineral resources.

The difficulty we find is that that kind of an agency will be neglected. If a cut comes, the Department will take practically all of it from that kind of an agency, so as to arouse public opinion in that particular section on the country and encourage the people to telegraph their Senators and Representatives. The result is to damage a particular activity, whereas the item which we are seeking to reduce is not reduced at all. We say, "Reduce your personnel 10 percent." That includes those who sit here in Washington, holding down nonessential jobs in public relations—lawyers, planners, and charters—who have nothing to do with the granting of leases. But the Government agency will reduce personnel where it thinks it will hurt the public the most. It is very difficult, in a Republic like ours, to reduce the budget.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I fully agree with the Senator, that there has been a failure on the part of various departments to reduce expenses in Washington. On the other hand, they will make cuts in the field. However, we find this situation in the Bureau of Land Management: It is far behind in its work of acting on leasing and other applications, not only in the field, but in Washington. When I first came to Washington they were 3 or 4 years behind in considering applications for patents for lands which had been proved up many years ago. Frequently we would have to go to the Department and have the officials hunt for an application, and then give it a red tag, or some sort of priority. They claimed then that they were handicapped in that office, and all down the line.

I feel that the Bureau of Land Management has been discriminated against somewhere—I do not know just where—to the extent that it has not been able to operate as it should operate. I know that it needs more personnel in the Salt Lake City office, and in some of the other offices. Until it can catch up in Washington, in the General Land Office, as it used to be called, it needs more help. So I do not want this cut to apply to an activity which is supposed to expedite the bringing in of oil, and the bringing in of more revenue to the Federal Government.

Mr. FERGUSON. The cut would not apply at all to what the Senator from Utah is talking about.

Mr. WATKINS. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. FERGUSON. The question is whether or not the activity to which the Senator has referred can be operated economically and properly with an appropriation of \$7,750,000. That is still a great deal of money.

Mr. WATKINS. That is still a great deal of money. I do not know how much is absolutely needed in Washington. Can the Senator point out any figures which would indicate an increase in the personnel in the offices which I have mentioned, or how a reduction in Washington could be worked out as a practical matter?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not have the amount in the Leasing Branch of the Department.

This cut is not from the budget estimate. The amount of the budget estimate has been increased. It is \$198,900 above the budget estimate. The Department did not even request this amount of money.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator from Michigan tell me what item he is speaking about?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am speaking about the item on page 8, line 12, under the heading of "Bureau of Land Management: Management of Lands and Resources." I am speaking particularly about taking \$198,900 out of the total amount, because it has been earmarked and added, above the budget estimate. I am also talking about a reduction of 10 percent in the item of Forest Management, which is \$39,404, making a grand total of \$238,304, from \$7,722,605.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thought I understood the Senator to say that, but I am sure he is mistaken. The budget estimate for this item, which I hold in my hand, is \$7,850,000. So the committee report of \$7,722,605 is below the budget estimate.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan was speaking only about one particular item, which was raised above the budget estimate by an amount of \$198,900. He was not talking about the entire budget.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Was the Senator speaking about the budget estimate for Forest Management? The budget estimate for management of lands and resources is divided as follows:

For the lease and disposal of lands and mineral resources, \$942,500; for land classification, \$634,900; for the grazing administration, \$1,475,600; for forest management, \$1,775,700; for cadastral surveys, \$804,300; for soil and moisture conservation, \$1,001,100; for the Squaw Butte Experiment Station, \$39,000; for fire suppression, \$150,000; for general administration, \$1,026,900; making a total of \$7,850,000.

When it is considered that that is an appropriation for the management of a bureau which is estimated to produce in revenue for the Federal Government during the next fiscal year in excess of \$43,000,000 or \$44,000,000, it seems clear to me that a cut below the committee report is bound to result in a decrease in the production of revenue which the Government needs.

Mr. FERGUSON. The figures are clear in the report, that the budget estimate for 1952 for soil and moisture conservation was \$1,001,100.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. The report indicates, on page 10, that the committee allowed \$1,002,000. In other words, it increased the amount above the budget estimate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The committee, composed of many Senators who have been studying this problem for a great many years, know perfectly well that one of the great resources we have is the soil, and that whatever we can do to promote soil and water conservation, particularly at this time, is decidedly in the public interest.

We cannot build defense plants without water. We cannot develop minerals without water. We cannot grow crops without soil. Soil conservation and water conservation help to reduce the appropriations which are needed for the building of huge flood-control projects. If we are able to retain water on the soil in the upper reaches of the stream we are able to save money for the Government of the United States.

I believe that in this item for the Bureau of Land Management, as in the case of the Bureau of Mines, and the Geological Survey, the committee has served the public interest. We have cut the appropriation as deeply as it could be properly cut. In my opinion, further cuts would only result in reducing the revenue of the Federal Government. Certainly we should not cut a productive enterprise of the Federal Government. A few Members of Congress, who have not had an opportunity to visit the public-land States, have no conception of the vast resources which are the property of all the people of the United States, and which are there to be found. We should and must continue the development of these vast resources.

I believe the Senator from Michigan knows, from service with the present speaker on the Committee on Appropriations, that I desire to cut appropriations wherever it is possible to cut them. I believe the Senator is making a grave mistake in advocating cuts in the administrative provisions of one of the most productive bureaus in the entire Government. The Senator from Utah spoke a moment ago about the revenues from oil. The revenues produced by the activities of the Bureau of Land Management, and by the Geological Survey in the handling of mineral leases and permits are perfectly remarkable. The actual cash receipts to the Treasury of the United States from the management of mineral leases and permits during the fiscal year 1950 amounted to \$29,115,664.64. The estimate for 1951 was \$32,500,000. When the figures were submitted we were scarcely half through the fiscal year 1951. Now we know that the estimate was a conservative estimate. The receipts for fiscal 1952 are estimated at \$34,250,000.

As chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I have had a certain responsibility with respect to the administration of the Department of the Interior. I know that there is now

a backlog of applications for mineral leases on the public domain, which cannot be handled because of the inadequacy of the staff. The Munitions Board has requested the petroleum industry to produce 1,000,000 barrels a day more than was produced in the last fiscal year. One of the principal sources from which increased production of oil can be derived is from leases issued upon the public domain.

In my State of Wyoming, in the State of Nebraska, represented by its senior Senator [Mr. BUTLER] and by the minority leader [Mr. WHERRY] there are now oil fields which are coming in under such leases. In Utah, the State represented by the senior Senator [Mr. WATKINS], in Colorado, and in Montana, there is a great opportunity to build up the production of oil. In this turbulent world of ours, particularly in view of the Iranian crisis, it would be utterly absurd, from my point of view, to cut the appropriation.

I believe the record is clear. The Senator from Michigan would be well advised to withdraw his amendment. I shall cooperate with the Senator in cutting where cuts can properly be made. I have demonstrated my willingness to do it, as the Senator well knows, in committee, when I voted against appropriations, much as I disliked to vote against the suggestion of the chairman of the subcommittee, for new starts or new additions to existing reclamation projects. That is where we can save money. Certainly it is not economy to curtail the administrative and managerial capacity of the Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Wyoming mentioned the revenues being received by the Government from the leasing of oil lands.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not the Senator agree with me that the revenues could be multiplied substantially if the Government were to lease the oil lands at competitive bidding, rather than at the minimum level, as they are now being leased?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not quite certain that the Senator is right. We considered the matter in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs several years ago. Witnesses were heard from every section of the country, and it was determined that the system which was provided for in the law is the better system to secure the development of the lands.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is the Senator aware of the fact that Mr. Clawson, who handles the subject in the Department of the Interior, stated that the Government is losing several million dollars annually under the present system, in leasing oil lands on a noncompetitive basis?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have not seen the statement; but I will say to the Senator that in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in 1946 I offered a bill to amend the leasing act. The bill pro-

vided for a flat royalty, instead of for a sliding-scale royalty. The argument was then made by representatives of the Department of the Interior that a flat royalty would reduce the revenue of the Government. My argument was that it would provide an incentive to get more people out upon the public domain looking for oil. The law was passed, as I had recommended it should pass, with a flat royalty of 12½ percent, which is the system employed, generally speaking, in the leasing of private lands.

The result was a tremendous increase in drilling upon the public domain and an increase in revenues to the Government, not a decrease. Of course, that is aside from the point under discussion.

The question is whether we shall appropriate the amount recommended by the subcommittee for the Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator that this discussion does not strictly relate to the question before us; however, the Senator referred to the revenue received by the Government. The RECORD should show that the revenue presently received by the Government is only a fraction of what the Government could collect if we leased the land on a competitive basis, as is recommended by the Department of the Interior. They further stated that it was impossible for any administrator to pass out these bargains without having the distribution of leases lending itself to the charge of political favoritism, whether or not such favoritism exists.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there is not the slightest ground for any allegation of political favoritism with respect to the distribution of oil and gas leases, because the law is specific in its provisions. I will not hesitate to say that most of the big companies which have leases upon the public domain cannot by any stretch of the imagination be regarded as political supporters of the administration. It is easy enough to charge political favoritism. However, I wish the Senator to know that Congress passed the law which governs the issuance of leases upon the public domain. I do not hesitate to say without the slightest reservation that the law is entirely objective and is free from any possibility of political favoritism.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will read the RECORD, I think he will find that I said it would lend itself to charges of political favoritism. That is what the official to whom I have referred said.

However, since the question has arisen, I wish to point out to the Senator an instance which I called to the attention of the Senate more than a year ago, in which political favoritism was being exercised in the leasing of oil lands, and in that connection I named five Government officials who had leased the land to themselves. All that information is in the RECORD. The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry seemed to be astounded when one of the Government officials came here and confirmed the fact that five Government officials were

involved. However, no hearings have been held on the matter since that time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator was talking about the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am speaking of Government-owned land and leases.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. However, the Senator from Delaware was speaking of the Department of Agriculture; was he not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say to the Senator that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has long been of the opinion that all leasing of mineral lands should be in the Department of the Interior. We are dealing here with appropriations for the Department of the Interior. I know of no single violation of the high standards of leasing the public domain since Albert Fall, Secretary of the Interior, leased the Teapot Dome in my State.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Merely because the Department of Agriculture happened to be the agency responsible for a little bit of political favoritism in the leasing of oil lands does not mean that everything is lovely.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Delaware did not describe political favoritism; he described official favoritism. If there was such favoritism, if any officials of any Department undertook to lease lands to themselves, I will join the Senator from Delaware in asking for a complete investigation and for the punishment of such officials.

However, I submit that it is going far afield from this appropriation bill to delve into activities in another Department. We are dealing now with appropriations for the Department of the Interior.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The names of those officials and all the details in regard to this case are a matter of record, and have been a matter of record for a year, during which the Senator from Wyoming and his party have had charge of the Congress, but nothing has been done.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Delaware has never mentioned this matter to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I will say to the Senator that that committee is composed of seven Democrats and six Republicans; and if my memory serves me correctly, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the United States Senate is also composed of seven Democrats and six Republicans. I am sure that if there is any criticism to be directed against either of those committees, it falls impartially upon all members of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, let me say that I am not directing the criticism necessarily against anyone; but since the question has come up further, I call the attention of the Senator from Wyoming, who is chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to the fact that I did call this matter to his attention over a year ago, at which

time I placed the details in the RECORD, and asked his committee to give attention to the need for competitive bidding. The Department of Interior in 1947 pointed out that political favoritism could be possible, and wanted to avoid it; also wanted to save millions of dollars for the Government; also wished to avoid a possible scandal; and they saw the possibility that such a condition could develop.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I submit that the testimony of the Senator from Delaware, which he is now giving, is now incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He repeatedly refers to political favoritism as though it were partisan political favoritism. That is the implication he seeks to make. However, the testimony he gives has nothing to do with political favoritism, but deals with the allegation that officials of a Government department—probably Civil Service officials—favored themselves. That is not the political favoritism which the Senator from Delaware seeks to imply.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I should like to point out that all political favoritism is charged to the party in power. The Senator from Wyoming has referred to the scandal in connection with the Teapot Dome. Certainly that was charged to the Republican Party, which was in power at that time; I am not denying that. Likewise, any political favoritism that exists today is charged to the Democratic Party, by the same token.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If there were any political favoritism.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But I say that the Senator from Delaware has utterly failed to substantiate any charge of political favoritism.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg to disagree. If the Senator from Wyoming will only read the RECORD, he will find the names.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have been listening to the colloquy between the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Delaware. Let me say that what makes the Government click, so to speak, or function, are appropriations. The junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee handling appropriations for the Department of Agriculture; and that subcommittee is now holding hearings, and will be in session at 2 o'clock this afternoon. If the Senator from Delaware cares to appear before that subcommittee and tell us about the things he is talking about now, I am sure he will find that neither the Democrats nor the Republicans on that subcommittee, which is composed of Members of this body, will agree that there should be any particular political favoritism.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wyoming will yield, so that I may reply to the Senator from New Mexico, I should like to point out to the Senator from New Mexico that what I

have just said in reference to political favoritism or official favoritism, or whatever one may call it, in connection with the leasing of lands under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture, has been called to the attention of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Last year I appeared before that committee in executive session. This matter has been submitted to that committee in writing. The chairman of the committee said he was going to check into it. He said that about a year ago, but to my knowledge nothing has been done.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware tell me, or will he tell the Senate, where the Department of Agriculture has any authority whatever to make mineral-land leases? That is a function of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico is mistaken. The Department of Agriculture did have such authority, until approximately 6 or 8 months ago, and was leasing certain lands which were under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. I agree with the Senator from Wyoming that all those lands should be placed under one Government agency, and one agency should handle them. Nevertheless, the Department of Agriculture did have authority to lease the lands which came under its jurisdiction during the depression. On the floor of the Senate I pointed out that the Department had leased some of the lands and had sold some of the leases to officials of the Government who themselves were handling the leases; and I pointed out that the Government had lost a substantial amount of money in that way.

That millions have been and are now being lost is concurred in by Mr. Clawson, of the Department of the Interior. The Government is losing millions of dollars annually by leasing these oil lands at noncompetitive rates.

Perhaps this matter has nothing to do with the appropriation bill now before the Senate. However, the Government's income is diminished by means of such proceedings, and of course an increased income to the Government would diminish the need for appropriations, if these matters were handled properly.

I further point out that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has all this information before it and has had it for over a year.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the point I am making is that the Committee on Appropriations is of course interested in the American taxpayers' dollars. If the Senator from Delaware will be so kind as to go before the subcommittee which is handling the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, and if he will tell his story there, I know we shall be glad to hear it, because we do not want anything of the sort he has mentioned to occur.

What I object to is an implication that any Senate committee would be partial politically when the American taxpayers' dollars are involved.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I point out to the Senator from New Mex-

ico that all this information is a matter of record, including the names of the officials and the list of the land leases transferred to them. All of it is in the RECORD, and was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I should like to see some action taken, instead of just letting the matter ride.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I admit that the standing committees of the Senate—for instance, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—are fine; but, of course, the only thing that makes the Government click, so to speak, is appropriations.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Government cannot function without having appropriations made. I am concerned about the charges made by the Senator from Delaware. We do not want such things to exist.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has the floor, and he has yielded for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well. Does not the Senator from Delaware feel that the matter should be called to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, that is what I am doing now.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In which case the committee could investigate the men the Senator has in mind, and the matter of their salaries, could it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think it should, and I call it to their attention again.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, since the regular order has been requested, I shall resume the floor. But I shall say, first, that this has been a very excellent illustration of irrelevant and immaterial talk. We are dealing here with an amendment which was offered by the Senator from Michigan to cut the appropriation on page 8 of the bill as reported by the committee, in line 12, from \$7,722,605 to \$7,484,301. The budget estimate for that item was \$7,850,000; so the committee made a cut in this item of more than \$100,000.

The Senator from Michigan desires to make an additional cut. My point, Mr. President, has been that the Bureau of Land Management is one of the most productive bureaus of the whole Government, productive in natural resources needed by the Government of the United States, and productive in revenue needed by the Government of the United States. I believe that mineral leases and permits alone in 1950 produced in excess of \$29,000,000, and, from the sale of public lands and materials, fees and commissions, grazing fees, sales of Indian lands, right-of-way leases, O & C and Coos Bay timber sales, which amounted to \$4,005,608.92, and other timber sales, amounting to \$364,666.07, with certain miscellaneous receipts, provided a total revenue of \$36,177,349.42 in 1950. The estimated revenues from these sources in 1952 amount to \$47,050,000. It seems to me, upon the face of it, comparing

the receipts with the cost of the maintenance of this Bureau, the amendment ought to be rejected.

Mr. President, out of the long experience, not only as a Member of the Senate, but also as a practicing attorney for many years in Washington at times, and back in my home State of Wyoming at other times, I want to say that the Bureau of Land Management and its predecessor, the General Land Office, has been one of the most efficient of all the bureaus of the Government, just as it is one of the oldest. The staff of that Bureau is composed of men and women with a high sense of duty, desiring to serve the public interests. Their record has been a record of production in the public interest, and, in my judgment, their appropriation should not be further reduced.

SUGGESTIONS FOR INCREASING REVENUE BY TAXES ON HORSE-RACE GAMBLING

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Arizona, to what I am about to say. Two or three days ago, he announced on the Senate floor that he was trying very hard to have this Congress adjourn. He said that the very earliest that the Congress could possibly adjourn, in his judgment, would be the 1st day of October. I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the majority of the Senators are Democrats, and that the House also has an overwhelming Democratic majority; in addition to which we have a Democratic President.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time.

I call attention to an insertion made by the Vice President of the United States, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 28, 1948, at page A4655, entitled "President Truman's Speech of Acceptance." I am going to repeat this several times, so I want to read it now so that the distinguished majority leader may contemplate what was said by Mr. Truman when he was a candidate. After enumerating a great many things which were immediately to be done, to which I shall advert, Mr. Truman, seeking the votes of the American people, and referring to the Republican Congress, said:

They can do this job in 15 days, if they want to do it. They will still have time to go out and run for office.

Mr. President, we were here throughout the year 1950, and we have been here over 6 months in 1951. I have not made the arithmetical calculation to determine how many times 15 that amounts to; but we have here the word of the President of the United States that a Congress which wanted to do the job could do all the things that he asked for in 15 days. The American people evidently believed the President, because they elected a Democratic Congress. Therefore, throughout 1950 and thus far in 1951, the opportunity has been given to the Democratic Party to fulfill their platform pledges in 15 days.

I call attention to the fact that my distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. KEM], shortly after the Congress convened in 1950, made a list of President Truman's recommendations and referred to this identical speech by President Truman, in which the President said that the Democratic Party could carry out its platform, if the Congress wanted to do it, within 15 days. Indeed, the distinguished Senator from Missouri not only called it to the attention of the Congress once, but he also called it to the attention of the Congress upon several different occasions. I refer, for example, to one paragraph of the President's speech, in which he said:

On the 26th day of July, which out in Missouri we call turnip day, I am going to call Congress back and ask them to pass laws to halt rising prices, to meet the housing crisis—which they are saying they are for in their platform.

Mr. President, I have in my hand the Democratic platform, adopted at the very time when the President received his nomination at Philadelphia. In it they say they are going to stop the rise in prices, they are going to provide for slum clearance, and they are going to provide homes for veterans; and certainly the President said he was going to do it within 15 days. But they were going to do more than that. In the Democratic platform it was said:

The Democratic Party is responsible for the great civil-rights gains made in recent years in eliminating unfair and illegal discrimination based on race, color, or creed.

What did they then promise? They promised that, if reelected, they were going to carry out the civil-rights program. They said the Democratic Party stood for—

(1) The right of full and equal political participation; (2) the right to equal opportunity of employment; (3) the right of security of person—

Evidently referring to the antilynch law—

(4) the right of equal treatment in the service and defense of our Nation.

If anyone believes, for example, that Negroes are getting a square deal in the Army, Navy, or Air Force at the present time, or that they are getting it in the matter of civil employment or as Federal employees, all he has to do is to go to the Government Printing Office and find that of the thousands of Negroes employed there, not one has ever become a foreman or one who has any real responsibility.

I am bringing this matter to the attention of the distinguished majority leader only because I believe if we could get this job completed in 15 days it would offer a wonderful chance to make good on what the President said when he stated that we could clear out slums, pass civil-rights legislation, and do many other things within 15 days.

I repeat, Mr. President, the Democrats have a majority in both Houses of Congress, and we have a Democratic President, and it should be a very simple proposition for them.

The Democrats also stated in their platform that they were going to balance the budget. The President said it could

be done within a short time. I suppose he expected Congress to pass, within 15 days, a law providing for the balancing of the budget.

In the next to the last paragraph of the President's speech, he said:

Now, my friends, with the help of God and the wholehearted push that you can put behind this campaign, we can save this country from a continuation of the Eightieth Congress.

That was the clarion call made by the President at that time. The people responded to it and gave him a Democratic Congress and elected him to the Presidency.

The Democratic Party has been in power through all of 1950 and part of 1951, but we find that they are apparently still not through with their labors, but are holding us here until the 1st day of October.

I am glad that my distinguished friend the majority leader is present—

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time. I know that with his great ingenuity we certainly should be able to adjourn before the 1st day of August. If he does not know how to do it, I suggest he talk to the President of the United States at the White House for 5 minutes, because the President is an expert. He said in his speech that all these things which I have enumerated, and a great many more dealing with Federal education and many others, could be acted upon in 15 days. I, for one, want to tell the distinguished Senator from Arizona that I have confidence in the President of the United States and in his ability, and if the Democratic leadership will follow the advice which the President will give to the majority leader and to the Democratic Policy Committee, there is no reason in the world why we can not get away by the 1st day of August.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time.

The Democrats keep on repeating that they are short of money; they want money all the time. The proceedings of the Senate's great anticrime committee were shown on television to many millions of persons.

In a possible endeavor to help raise some money I introduced two bills dealing with the matter of stopping the shipment of racing information in interstate commerce and providing revenue, so that the great Democratic Party, which has the responsibility of raising money, could receive some aid.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] stated awhile ago that every committee is made up of seven Democrats and six Republicans. That is not strictly true.

One of my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle said that we took the blame for the Teapot Dome scandal. Likewise, the Democrats are responsible for the predicament in which they find themselves.

I want to talk about one of the bills which I introduced.

The Members of this body will perhaps recollect that on June 8, 1951, I introduced a bill, Senate bill 1627, requiring the operators of racing enclosures wherein betting is legalized by State law to file forms containing the name and address of all persons to whom \$50, or more, is paid. At that time I stated that the racing business is the only business in America which keeps no records of the names of persons to whom millions are paid out annually even though we require the little housewife, who is fortunate enough to have a domestic, to keep records if \$50, or more, a month is paid to such domestic.

This housewife may be a woman who perhaps has three or four little children, but if she is fortunate enough to have a part-time maid she must keep records if \$50 or more a month is paid to such part-time maid. That amounts to \$600 a year.

I have given considerably more study to this matter, since I have had an opportunity to study the proposed revenue act of 1951 and the House Ways and Means Committee report.

I want to assure my distinguished friend from Arizona that my sole purpose is to help the Democrats. I never have wanted to be an obstructionist. When the Democrats introduce a good measure, I try to help, and I have given them, I believe, some very valuable suggestions in the years during which I have been a Member of the Senate.

I have four suggestions to make at this time to which I feel each and every Member of this body should give his careful attention and study and particularly those of our colleagues who constitute the Finance Committee. This is particularly true in this year when the proposed revenue act would cause an increase in the tax burden to be borne by both individuals and corporations and the suggestions which I am about to make will, I feel, go a long way toward lessening that burden.

The first of these suggestions is with respect to chapter 27A—Wagering Taxes, "Subchapter A—Tax on Wagers, section 3285, subsection E," of the proposed revenue act.

Mr. President, I hope the distinguished majority leader will be able to keep track of these four suggestions, because they represent the bringing in of millions of dollars which at the present time are not paying any taxes, while the poor housewife with two or three children and with a part-time maid has to keep a record if she pays \$50 a month to her maid.

The section reads as follows—and I hope that my distinguished friend will not leave the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time. It is very important that the Senator from Arizona hear my suggestions.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield. The section to which I have referred reads as follows:

(e) Exclusions from tax: No tax shall be imposed by this subchapter (1) on any wager

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the record from which I have read be printed in full at this point in

my remarks, because it also includes harness racing and fairs, in addition to thoroughbred racing.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Pari-mutuel turn-over, revenue to States, 1950

[Taken from the American Racing Manual, 1951 edition, p. 428]

	Pari-mutuel turn-over				Revenue to State			
	Total	Thoroughbred	Harness	Fairs	Total	Thoroughbred	Harness	Fairs
Arizona.....	\$6,083,233	\$6,083,233			\$394,274.05	\$394,274.05		
Arkansas.....	10,922,763	10,922,763			671,145.50	671,145.50		
California.....	278,073,056	235,296,974	\$26,407,447	\$13,368,635	14,795,872.41	13,004,916.06	\$1,134,299.95	\$656,656.40
Colorado.....	8,762,350	8,762,350			719,164.70	719,164.70		
Delaware.....	22,761,763	22,761,763			864,292.51	864,292.51		
Florida.....	94,740,160	94,740,160			8,244,213.55	8,244,213.55		
Illinois.....	147,210,290	125,730,720	21,579,570		9,084,496.87	7,081,738.67	1,102,758.20	
Kentucky.....	27,309,447	27,309,447			847,163.12	847,163.12		
Louisiana.....	15,712,115	15,712,115			810,472.70	810,472.70		
Maine.....	9,435,677	5,476,814	3,958,863		519,831.55	321,578.40	198,253.15	
Maryland.....	100,143,739	70,794,363	16,864,776	12,484,741	5,050,011.04	3,995,353.38	681,121.50	373,536.16
Massachusetts.....	56,707,579	46,155,458	7,439,049	3,113,072	3,512,344.09	2,975,663.66	469,025.44	67,654.99
Michigan.....	68,746,632	50,372,494	18,002,138		3,370,561.92	2,862,751.60	507,811.32	
Nebraska.....	11,615,219	11,615,219			53,902.00	53,902.00		
New Hampshire.....	31,475,600	31,310,902	164,698		1,773,908.50	1,764,277.77	9,630.73	
New Jersey.....	156,632,158	155,211,840	1,420,318		11,820,792.28	11,731,830.30	88,961.98	
New Mexico.....	4,110,216	4,110,216			57,942.74	57,942.74		
New York.....	452,888,165	308,477,512	144,410,653		29,542,378.78	20,595,582.62	8,946,796.16	
Ohio.....	33,658,002	27,747,650	5,424,947	485,405	1,102,088.91	916,900.17	173,148.01	12,040.73
Oregon.....	3,085,760	2,244,121		841,639	111,997.99	84,790.68		27,207.31
Rhode Island.....	61,832,104	61,832,104			3,508,177.83	3,508,177.83		
South Dakota.....	330,311	330,311			10,534.33	10,534.33		
Washington.....	11,752,959	11,752,959			599,021.95	599,021.95		
West Virginia.....	23,987,761	23,987,761			756,559.83	756,559.83		
Grand total.....	1,637,705,199	1,358,739,248	245,672,459	30,293,492	98,221,189.65	83,772,287.62	13,311,806.44	1,137,095.59

1 Flat racing and harness racing under jurisdiction of separate commissions.

Remarks: Colorado—Marked increase in wagering over previous year due to opening in 1950 of only major track; Centennial Park, 46 days' racing. Maine—First year for thoroughbred racing in Maine; decrease in total wagering at harness tracks largely due to cancellation of racing dates at Gorham and Lewiston. Maryland—Pari-mutuel turnover at mile tracks 2.28 percent decrease, fairs 10.9 percent decrease; harness racing 43.50 percent increase. West Virginia—Decrease due to fewer racing days.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate send a copy of this address to the chairman of the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	McKellar
Bricker	Hennings	Millikin
Bridges	Hill	Monroney
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Moody
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Morse
Byrd	Humphrey	Mundt
Cain	Hunt	Neely
Capehart	Ives	Nixon
Carlson	Jenner	O'Connor
Case	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Cordon	Kem	Russell
Dirksen	Kerr	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Duff	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Lehman	Stennis
Ecton	Lodge	Taft
Ellender	Long	Thye
Ferguson	Magnuson	Underwood
Flanders	Malone	Watkins
Frear	McCarran	Welker
Fulbright	McCarthy	Wherry
George	McClellan	Williams
Hayden	McFarland	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the committee amendment on page 8, in lines 10 to 13.

Mr. BRIDGES. On the question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the demand for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the minority leader, please? I ask unanimous consent that after this vote, it be agreed, by unanimous consent, that there be a limitation on debate of 30 minutes on all amendments, the time to be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents of the amendment, and to be controlled, respectively, by the proponent of the amendment and the senior Senator from Arizona, except that when he favors an amendment, the time allotted to those in opposition to the amendment be in the control of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]; and that there be a limitation of 1 hour on debate on the bill, to be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents, and to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the proposed limitation in regard to debate on amendments?

Mr. McFARLAND. Thirty minutes on each amendment, to be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents, and to be controlled, respectively, by the proponent of the amendment and the Senator from Arizona, as stated in the proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, now that we have agreed to the limitation, I understand that it provides for 30 minutes on each amendment and 1 hour on the bill, or 30 minutes to each side on the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, now that the yeas and nays have been ordered on the question of agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment, I should like to make a brief statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not yet been ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in behalf of the committee: The Bureau of Land Management is an agency which produces revenue for the Government. The 1952 estimate is that it will bring in a total of \$47,000,000, at an expense of \$8,048,000. The principal source of revenue is from oil leases on the public domain.

At the present time there has been great delay in consummating such leases. Yet the Senator from Michigan would have us cut the personnel engaged in that work, although such a cut would result in further delay.

The Senator from Michigan also suggests that the committee made a mistake in not applying the 10 percent cut to the personnel engaged in selling timber. Mr. President, timber cannot be sold properly unless the forest has been cruised and unless the trees which are to be sold are indicated, if a sustained yield is to be maintained.

The committee, having heard all the facts, decided that the amount of money provided by the committee amendment

was necessary and that it was in the interest of the Government that it be appropriated.

Therefore, I ask that the committee amendment be sustained.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I recall that during World War II a somewhat similar situation arose in connection with appropriations for the Forest Service, which requested supplemental funds in order that it might cruise some timber. The report on that operation, a year later, was that the Government had recovered \$4 for every dollar spent, by being able to sell the timber, at the time the timber was needed, at the current market, for stumpage, which was very high, as the Senator, I am sure, knows.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is exactly the situation in this instance. This Bureau has charge of what is known as the Oregon and California Land Grant. Some of the heaviest stands of timber in the United States are on that land. The trees to be marketed must be approved, and if there is a reduction in the personnel which approves the trees which are to be marketed, it becomes impossible to get the timber out. The expenditure pays for itself, over and over again. If we were not to provide sufficient money to enable the work to be done it would not be economic but would be shortsighted in the extreme.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona if this is the same Bureau of Land Management which has charge of the grazing services?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, the grazing service appropriation in this item, out of the \$8,000,000 estimated, is \$1,475,000. They collect \$2,100,000 in grazing fees; so nothing is lost, but, on the contrary, a profit is made.

Mr. MALONE. I suppose the Senator from Arizona is familiar with the fact that they are slowly clamping down on the grazing areas, and that there is less livestock in many of the areas today than there was several years ago.

Mr. HAYDEN. That may be true in certain areas of the United States.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator is also no doubt familiar with the fact that the fees are continually rising, and that in a desert area.

Also taxes had been collected on the headquarters ranches which included the value of the adjacent range for 50 years until Mr. Ickes had the great inspiration of charging for the use of this desert land.

The people paid taxes on the whole area, through the headquarters ranches, because they had the use of the desert range land and the ranches had little value without the range. The ranches were of little or no value when they were too far away from the towns to ship the hay and the grain to the market. The feed produced on such ranches must be marketed through the livestock. This is

the same Bureau of Land Management which has squeezed out of the livestock ranchers, fees to the extent of \$2,000,000, in addition to the taxes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I know; but the livestock men of the West, through their association, made an agreement with the Bureau of Land Management that the fees could be raised—and they have been raised during the past year—upon condition that they get the service they were paying for.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Carrying out that agreement, they have paid more money. We are trying to give them the service we promised to give them in that agreement.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I would be very happy if the Senator would tell me how we will win on the desert and range areas by continued pressure on the part of a Government bureau to take all of the value of the feed through range fees, in return for services which the recipients would be very glad to furnish, themselves, if given the opportunity.

Mr. HAYDEN. There must be regulation of grazing on the public domain. When we did not have it, anyone could use the public domain for grazing at any time; so we passed what was known as the Taylor Grazing Act. At that time we put the grazing on the public domain under regulation, and we established grazing fees to pay the cost. The benefits received by the man who operates the range is that he has a certain area on the range assigned to him, and he pays a fee for using it. He would much rather pay the fee than have migratory herds of cattle and sheep coming in to eat the grass. The users of the range are adequately compensated for the fees they pay.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I regret that it is necessary to emphasize this particular point since I realize that time is of the essence in the Senator's argument. He emphasizes the cruising of timber, when, as a matter of fact, that is only a small part of the work of the Bureau of Land Management.

RANGE SUPERVISION

Range supervision has simply been carried to a ridiculous extreme, so that instead of making the range carry more cattle and sheep, there is continual pressure to reduce the number of cattle and sheep. In other words, the more regulation they get the less livestock they are able to run. They are simply breaking many of the livestock men on the desert areas. On some of the desert areas, much of it in my own State and, I am informed, in the State of Idaho, it requires as much as 140 acres to run a cow unit. The ranchers have paid taxes on the value of the range lands through the headquarter ranches for 75 years—yet the Bureau of Land Management charges a fee for supervision, sending swarms of men, many of

whom would not know the nature of desert feed. The desert is entirely different from the humid East, where grass grows all over the ground.

I had intended to bring this question up in a future major debate. It was not my intention to debate it at this time, but the Bureau is applying continual pressure to include every acre of such lands in their supervised areas and it cannot be ignored.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator wants the situation corrected he must seek to amend the Taylor Grazing Act. We have a law on the statute books which requires administration. All I am saying is that the committee has considered the appropriation adequate for the purpose. There would be nothing gained by cutting out the appropriation.

Mr. MALONE. The only control we have over these bureaus at the present time is to trim them down to our size.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator wants to abolish the Grazing Service—

Mr. MALONE. I am not saying that I want to abolish the Grazing Service, but I think it should be amended to curtail their activities—to adjudicate the range use in the same manner as the State engineer adjudicates the right to the use of water in the arid areas.

Mr. HAYDEN. That may be; but the point I am making, is that the Bureau is collecting more money than it is paying out, and the law is satisfactory generally throughout the West.

Mr. MALONE. It is blood money, and it is not satisfactory. I beg the Senator's pardon. Under pressure, if the cattle and sheep men do not acquiesce, they get their range rights reduced. It is done under threat and blackmail.

The headquarters ranches are largely valueless without the use of the range—spring, summer, fall, and winter range—therefore the total investment is controlled by the range supervisor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I know of no cattleman in the east who would not welcome the privilege of grazing on the public domain. Mr. DiSalle is using figures on price roll-backs based in large part on the production of beef on the public domain. In addition to that, there has been a constant conflict for 20 years between the wildlife conservationists and the cattle raisers, and there has been a conflict between the big cattle people and the little cattle people. As the Senator from Arizona has stated, we tried to settle it some years ago by passing the Taylor Grazing Act. There has been constant agitation in recent years from some sources to break down, nullify, and destroy the Taylor Grazing Act. We know that before that there were areas of overgrazing. Sheep were run on the high slopes and the sheep ate not only the grass, but the root of the grass, which caused serious erosion. We tried to regulate the matter not only in the natural resource interests, but in the interests of the cattle raisers and the sheep raisers themselves.

Unless the Senator wants to make a frontal attack—

Mr. MALONE. That may be the only effective way to get at a Government bureau.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then let the Senator make it before the committee which has jurisdiction of the Taylor Grazing Act, and not attempt to nullify the administration of the law.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. My time is very limited.

Mr. MALONE. I do not think the time is too limited.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is limited to 30 minutes.

Mr. MALONE. This is a very important question.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Has the Senator from Virginia ever seen any desert grazing of the land in question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have seen it from the air, but I did not see it closely.

Mr. MALONE. I think the debate would indicate that fact.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The junior Senator from Virginia has been in touch with the conservation program of this Nation very intimately long before the distinguished Senator from Nevada entertained the ambition of being a Senator.

Mr. MALONE. But the junior Senator from Nevada was sleeping in the cow and sheep camps before the junior Senator from Virginia ever heard of desert range land.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I know what others who sleep in cow camps are trying to do with the public domain, and I want to help to stop it.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I want to join with the junior Senator from Nevada. When it comes to all the praise which has been given to the Bureau of Land Management, I happen to have been a sheepherder myself and therefore am a graduate of the grazing school of experience. I receive daily in my mail, as do most western Senators, I think, complaint after complaint about the army of inspectors that is tramping all over our area and limiting our cattlemen out of business. I invite the attention of the Senator from Arizona to one district which raised more cattle 25 years ago than it raises today. Last year they had better grazing than they have had in 25 years. At this very moment I am handling complaints of not less than 25 cattlemen whose grazing allotments are being cut from 20 to 70 percent. I am going to join with the junior Senator from Nevada to examine and reexamine the Bureau of Land Management from the top on down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASMORE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the committee amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, from what has been said, one would think the Senator from Michigan was trying to wreck the Forest Service. Let us see what the amendment would do. The

amendment would do exactly what the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations did, and that was to cut off \$39,404. When the item came to the committee as a whole, because of a definition of the agency, the amount was put back in the bill. It is now said we are trying to wreck forest management. Let us see whether we are. In 1951 the budget estimate was \$1,492,000. In 1952, before we take off the amount of \$39,404, it is \$1,775,700. It is nearly \$300,000 more than the 1951 budget estimate. So when we take the \$39,404 off, which is applying the 10-percent rule, we arrive at the amount of \$1,736,296.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CORDON. Would the Senator from Michigan be interested in having in front of him at this time some rather pertinent information as to what happened as the result of the increase in the appropriation for forest management?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. CORDON. Would he be interested in the fact that in 1948, when the appropriation was \$323,000, there was a net return that year of \$422,000 to the Treasury, that in 1947, when the appropriation had been increased to \$410,800, the return in net money to the Treasury jumped to \$1,161,228? That in 1948 when the appropriation went up to \$469,300, the amount of money that came into the Federal Treasury was \$1,938,000, and that it has so continued to increase? Furthermore, this money is used to put men into the field so they can mark and classify timber, so the Government can sell the timber, get the money for it and put the money into the Treasury?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan understands that. There is no dispute about those figures. The Senator from Michigan would allow more than the three hundred and some odd thousand dollars more than the 1951 budget, but he would cut 10 percent off that excess, which would still leave them \$300,000 more than they had last year.

As to the soil conservation, all the Senator from Michigan is asking is that there be a return to the budget estimate, which would take \$198,900 off the appropriation recommended by the committee. On the two amendments it makes a total of \$238,304. There is not any attempt to wreck this agency. The purpose is to do the same with this agency as was done with the other seven items. The Senator from Michigan is asking that all the items under the Bureau of Land Management be treated alike.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan. I want to state first that I have gone along with the Senator where I thought I could, where I thought economies could be effected. I disagreed with him on the 10-percent cut. I thought a 5-percent cut across the board was as much of a cut in basic personnel as the Nation could stand. I think 10 percent is too much. I know it is too much when it

is applied indiscriminately, when it is applied to all service agencies without regard to the value or necessity of the work with which they are charged and without regard to their history of efficiency in doing the job. However, that is beside the point.

I merely want to call the attention of the Senate to the forest-management item, which is small, and to the other item which would be affected by the amendment of \$198,000, which is in the soil and moisture field. I will take them up in reverse order.

As to the soil and moisture item, Mr. President, an argument can be made to eliminate it. I freely confess that. I think perhaps if we were to take the Bureau of Land Management appropriation and say that its appropriation must be reduced \$198,000, this item is probably as good a place as we could find to make the cut. But I do not think the Senate ought to legislate in that way. I think we should first ask ourselves, "Is this soil and moisture program one that is in the very real interest of the United States and its people?" That program represents the work of the Department in the nature of preventive medicine. It attempts to stop floods before they occur. It attempts to hold the water where it will do good and not harm. It may be said, "Oh well, we are in an emergency; we have got this terrific defense budget facing us," and that statement would be entirely correct.

But, Mr. President, it would be a strange philosophy to be adopted in the United States that while spending billions and tens of billions of dollars, as we must spend them, in order to protect ourselves from foreign enemies, we ourselves should destroy our own resources within our own borders, and to the extent of such destruction ourselves become our own enemies.

For that reason, Mr. President, I believe that we should stand by what I believe was the sound discretion of the subcommittee. I do not want to say that I have any knowledge that is not possessed by others. I do want to say that I have long been acquainted with the work of the Interior Department. I knew it long before I came to the Senate, particularly the work of what is now termed the Bureau of Land Management. I knew it when it was the General Land Office. I did legislative work in connection with the Bureau years before I came to the Senate. I have a working knowledge of what the Department does, of how they do it, and of its importance or lack of importance.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I shall be happy to yield in a moment. I should like to say, Mr. President, to those who may have confidence in my judgment, if any there be, that in my judgment this budget item was cut by the committee as much as it ought to be cut even in these hours of stress which we face.

I now yield to my colleague.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I ask my colleague two questions, I hope he will not be embarrassed by my say-

ing on the floor of the Senate that I think my colleagues in the Senate ought to know that my senior colleague is recognized in my section of the country as the outstanding authority in this whole field of O. & C. land-management problem.

He worked intensively in this field before he came to the Senate. I would rather have my colleague's opinion on the problems of O. & C. land management than the opinion of any other man in the country, because I think he knows more about the problem than any other man, including any man in the service of the Federal Government, even in the Bureau of Land Management itself.

With that observation, I wish to ask my colleague a few questions. First, is it his opinion that the budget which he seeks to have adopted in the case of this particular item will, if expended, bring back into the Federal Treasury much more money than any saving the Ferguson amendment in respect to this particular item could possibly make for the Federal Government?

Mr. CORDON. First, let me thank my colleague for his generous expression. I wish I deserved it.

With respect to his question, while an expenditure in soil and moisture conservation operations cannot be said to return an immediate dollar for every dollar expended, to the extent that it saves the soil surface, to the extent that it prevents lower-stream flows, to the extent that it holds water where water is needed throughout the public-land area, it is the consensus of all with whom I have talked that it is one of the soundest approaches to one of the most serious problems we have.

Mr. MORSE. My second question deals with the possible saving of national wealth, through the Government, which would flow from keeping the personnel at the level at which my colleague thinks it ought to be kept, from the standpoint of the harvesting of Federal timber which otherwise would get into an over-ripe condition and be wasted. Does my colleague agree with me that we need the personnel called for by his proposal in order to do the cruising job necessary to get the timber in shape so that it can be offered to private lumbermen for purchase and manufacture?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the answer to the last question the Senator from Oregon can give of his own knowledge.

In western Oregon there is an area of some 2,200,000 acres of timberland, title to which originally went from the Federal Government to a railroad company in one of the old railroad land-grants. Title was recaptured by the Government after extensive litigation followed by legislation. I shall have more to say on that subject when I offer an amendment to the bill later in its consideration. That area contains some of the finest merchantable timber growing in the United States. It is in a very mountainous area, difficult of access. Finding survey lines alone is a terrific job. In many instances, a new survey must be made in order to locate lines.

That becomes very important in this particular case, because the property in

question is not in one solid block. It consists of the odd-numbered sections over an area some 40 miles wide and 340 miles long. The intervening even-numbered sections are privately owned to the extent of about 99 percent, at least. All of this is timbered land. That timber is now selling in the stump at an average price in excess of \$12 per thousand. I knew the day when it could be bought for 50 cents per thousand in the stump.

A number of years ago the Congress very wisely enacted legislation to require the management of that vast timber principally on a consistent or perpetual-yield basis, which is another way of saying that it required its management on an annual-crop basis, cutting in 1 year no more than was reproduced in that year. That kind of management, as private industry has found, pays dividends. I am happy to say that in our country today private industry is turning more and more to that kind of timber management, especially in the southern area. It is found to be profitable. However, it does cost money. It costs money to go over that kind of area and determine what timber should be sold, what should be reserved, and what is a reasonable appraised or upset price to place upon it; to determine, after the sale, if the terms of the sale have been complied with, and to determine if the area has had the debris and fire hazard removed, and that sort of thing. It is a management or operation problem.

The point I wish to make is that today it is a paying proposition in dollars and cents to the Federal Government. The amount of net return, the amount of money coming unentailed into the Treasury, the amount of new money which has no claim against it except the claim of the general debt, increases mathematically with the number of persons who are put on the job to make timber sales, so long as the demand for the timber exceeds the amount of timber available. The demand now far exceeds the amount available.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. CORDON. Just a moment, and I shall be happy to yield.

About 2 weeks ago I received a letter from a former governor of the State of Oregon, Charles A. Sprague, of Salem, Oreg., the editor and publisher of the Salem Statesman in that city, and one of the outstanding citizens of the State and of the United States. He is a very public-spirited man, a man with sound judgment, who is giving of his time to serve on an advisory committee with the Bureau of Land Management, through its administration in that area, in the handling of this very valuable national asset.

Ex-Governor Sprague advised me in his letter that the Bureau of Land Management would be unable this year—and I hope the Senator from Michigan will follow me in this statement—to offer for sale timber with respect to which there are requests from more than 100 applicants, all of which timber is what is known as salvage timber. That means timber so defective that it is not purchased by the average operator. It means the kind of timber which is most

dangerous as a fire hazard. It means the kind of timber which must be removed if new timber is to be grown. Even with the full amount of the budget estimate, those applications cannot all be granted. I doubt whether more than a small fraction of them can be granted. We should have for this kind of a job not less money, but an amount which would permit of management at the highest state of efficiency, and with the greatest rate of return in unencumbered dollars to the Federal Treasury.

I am sorry that I took so much time to answer my colleague's question, but I had to go into it somewhat comprehensively.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I will say to my colleague that I am delighted with his answer to my question. I wish to associate myself with his answer, because I completely agree with his observations.

I have one last question, but as a matter of courtesy I shall be very glad to forego asking it until the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] asks the question which he seeks to ask.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator is very kind. However, the senior Senator from Oregon has already answered the question. I was about to call his attention to the testimony before our committee as to the kind of timber which had to be inspected and divided. One kind was the first-class timber, which sold at the high prices which the Senator has mentioned. The other kind was the so-called salvage timber. However, the Senator has answered the question I had intended to ask.

Mr. CORDON. I am happy that I did. I regret that I became so interested that I overlooked the fact that the Senator had asked to be recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I heard some discussion this afternoon with regard to the relationship between the Bureau of Land Management and the livestock producers of the West. Can the Senator tell us whether it is not his understanding that the livestock associations of our State—and I believe it is typical of the associations of the Pacific Northwest—in the years gone by have urged that an adequate personnel be maintained in the Bureau of Land Management, in order to give them the kind of service they need? Can the Senator tell us whether in his opinion the personnel which he is recommending in this instance is needed not only to take care of the problems of the persons who want to buy timber, but also the problems of the livestock men, who want to be better served by the Bureau of Land Management?

Mr. CORDON. In answer to the question of my distinguished colleague I have had, as I said, requests from users of the public domain under the administration of the Taylor Grazing Act for the full Budget appropriations in the bill. Such letters I believe are deemed to be confidential and personal. I am certain that there was no pressure put upon any permittee to get such letters written. I have had the opportunity to sit in the privacy of my own office, and to discuss the mat-

ter with the president of the Oregon Stock Growers Association. He gave me the same information that was brought to me by letter.

Furthermore, Mr. President, several years ago I was a member of a subcommittee which conducted hearings on the Taylor Grazing Act administration in the field in the West. We did not reach some of the areas where I understand there have been many complaints made about the service. Our hearings were held at Boise, Idaho, and in the State of Oregon. We heard the usual criticisms that one can expect to hear. Many of them I have no doubt were well founded insofar as changes are concerned. I believe most of the changes have been made. I know that the public domain is a better asset to the United States today because of the Taylor Grazing Act. Had it not been for that act there would have been the old cutthroat overgrazing competition throughout the area. There would have been unsettled land values. There would not have been the present plentiful supply of beef from that section of the country.

Mr. MORSE. If my colleague will yield further I will say that his answer, in regard to the attitude of large stockmen, is identical with the information which the livestock men of my State, who have talked to me, have given to me. I wish to say that I associate myself with my colleague in his opposition to the amendment, because I believe the Ferguson amendment in this particular regard is not an amendment for true economy but is an amendment for false economy.

Mr. CORDON. I think my colleague for his comments.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon, in whom I have the fullest confidence, whether he is entirely familiar with the differences in the type of range land throughout the West, that is to say, where the difference in latitude and elevation and rainfall make such a wide difference in the carrying capacity of the range land.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon must admit that he is not entirely familiar with it. He is familiar with the fact of its existence. He is familiar with it a little more than casually in his own State.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I believe the statement of the distinguished Senator from Oregon may be applicable to certain portions of his State, which contains some very humid areas.

Mr. CORDON. I will say to my friend from Nevada that my State contains some very arid areas, also.

Mr. MALONE. Yes. I was about to say that perhaps the areas pronounced by the United States Geological Survey requiring as much as 140 acres per cow unit might apply to some of the south-

eastern area of Oregon where the States of Oregon and Nevada border.

Mr. CORDON. We have them, too.

Mr. MALONE. Perhaps that is not applicable where the rainfall, latitude, or elevation bring the carrying capacity to as much as three or five or ten acres per cow unit.

Mr. CORDON. That is true wherever the elements of latitude and precipitation are present.

Mr. MALONE. Wherever we have areas of very sparse vegetation, with as low as 3½ inches of rainfall annually, a difference of one-half an inch or an inch in rainfall, or a difference in the spacing of such rainfall or times of year of the rainfall, makes so much more difference in the amount of feed than any supervision could possibly make—the attitude of the Bureau of Land Management becomes of paramount importance.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator understands that?

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada understands the differences. He served on a President's Commission about 20 years ago, which was set up to examine the value and carrying capacity of the range land of the Western States. The investigation covered the entire public domain, which is mostly located in about 11 Western States. It was realized that no one prescription would serve all of the wide range of land values. We had had a public-land policy since the Civil War, that the Federal Government was holding the lands in trust for the States until a public law could be enacted by which such lands could reach private ownership and thus go on the tax rolls.

The Homestead Act of the sixties was the first move. We gave away the corn land in Iowa and areas west through Kansas for a filing fee of \$16. Then an additional homestead of 160 acres was added because of lighter rainfall. That took us out onto the mesas in Colorado where the rainfall was less. There they added a grazing homestead of 640 acres, so they had a total of 960 acres. That carried the homesteaders west to Utah and parts of Nevada.

The old saying used to be that the Government was betting 160 acres against the \$16 filing fee that the homesteader could not make it, and finally were winning most of the bets.

Suddenly, with the advent of Mr. Ickes, we quit trying to bring it under private ownership. As Secretary of the Interior he suddenly discovered the 400,000,000 acres of desert land and figured it was a Government asset which belonged to all of the people and that it should never go into private ownership, but could be charged for every year in the form of rental.

I have heard figures quoted, which I shall investigate for later discussion, to the effect that we have collected \$2,000,000 through the Bureau of Land Management and that it spent only \$1,500,000. I think an investigation will find a great deal of overhead which is not included in the listed expenditures.

The figures should be analyzed and furnished the Senate in understandable form. I intend to do just that.

Furthermore, Mr. President, as the junior Senator from Nevada said a moment ago in debate with the senior Senator from Virginia that the key ranges had been taxed through the headquarters ranches for 70 years, since such ranches have little or no value without the range.

When we talk about a band of sheep or two bands of sheep or 250 head of cattle, or 400 head of cattle, we are talking about townships instead of sections or quarter sections since the carrying capacity is limited.

The people who settled those areas are paying taxes on the whole area through the headquarters ranches. If suddenly the range lands utilized were deeded to those who own and control the headquarters ranches, their taxes could not be raised, because they are already paying taxes on the value of the entire range unit.

So the headquarters ranches controlled the ranges, and for many years the homesteaders and the cattlemen and the sheepmen understood the range diversion.

There were what we called range fights until a method was worked out through State laws to determined range use. I note that some Senators still do not quite understand that the range use was and should be a State matter to work out ways and means to determine range use in the same manner as the determination of the right to the use of water.

The State of Nevada passed a stock-water law to control the use of the range. The law made it a trespass offense for a person to use a watering place without the right so to do. The law gave the State engineer the right to turn down any applications for additional stock-water rights when the range in that area was substantially utilized by those who had the existing right.

Some of us believe that instead of the objective being to decrease the carrying capacity of the ranges, by cutting down on their use, some method should be found to adjudicate the use of the range, without the authority to manipulate its use, and without the necessity of another layer of charges—on the land, in addition to the taxes.

ADJUDICATION OF RANGE USE

So some of us believe that a trial should be made to simply adjudicate the range use in the same manner as the State engineer adjudicates the right to the use of water in the arid areas. The isolated ranches have no value apart from the range land and the water for irrigation and for stock watering purposes. A determination of the right to the use of the ranges could be made by the Bureau of Land Management without having the newly graduated agricultural experts with little actual experience in the hair of the stockmen all of the time; such an arrangement would make sense.

With that explanation, I wish to say that I am very sympathetic in regard to the request for the appropriation of the amount of money that is necessary to be spent for cruising and for estimating the amount of saleable timber in Oregon.

However, the only means by which we can keep some check on the Bureau of Land Management activity is to control these activities through appropriations until we can amend the present law or through passing a measure applicable to special areas. In the meantime we must control the size of these appropriations for otherwise those in charge will continue the pressure to collect more and more money from the stockmen, and will continue to decrease the number of the cattle and sheep on the ranges—and increase the number of men supervising the range. It is simply a vicious circle as it now stands and there is no end to it.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Nevada, and I have a great deal of confidence in his judgment. I do not know of anyone in the West who is more intimately acquainted with the public-land problem in the entire West, and particularly in his home State, than is GEORGE MALONE. I know that in his past experience as a State officer, he has traversed almost every foot of that territory. I know he has had personal experience in connection with this problem.

I cannot comment on the situations which exist in much of Nevada. I have been here and there in the State, and I know something about the desert characteristics of much of it. In a great deal of the Nevada area, the precipitation is perhaps not one-third of what it is in the most arid section of Oregon. So those problems are present, and unquestionably changes could be made in the methods of administration of the grazing service which would be all to the good. It would be strange if that were not so, even though the service were being operated by the people who were using the range, and more strange when it is operated as an absentee by the Federal Government. So there is no argument there, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. In a moment. I recognize the argument, and there may well be real merit in the suggestion which the Senator from Nevada has made with reference to the Adjudication Board. The only thing I can say about it is that we cannot turn aside to take care of that type of substantive legislation now. We tried it yesterday, and, in the end, I think we did not do too good a job. I am afraid that if we started in on this subject, we would not be able to adjourn even by the first of October; so we simply must determine now what we shall do with reference to the appropriation to be made in the pending bill for the coming year.

The testimony which impressed me most was that there was going into effect an increase in the per-animal-unit fee. It is going to be paid, anyway. It can go into the Treasury. God knows there is room enough in the Treasury for it,

and for a great deal more money, so far as that is concerned; but in this case it is being paid by the people who are using the range. I should like to see as much of it as possible go back onto the range, because it does two things: First, it increases the value of the range to the people who are now using it, and second, it increases its value as a national asset for all time to come.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield first to the Senator from Idaho; then I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WELKER. I appreciate that it is impossible for us of the West to affect the Bureau of Land Management by a sidling attack, as we are attempting to do. A few moments ago I paid my respects to the Bureau of Land Management, and I note that the two Senators from the State of Oregon apparently disagree with me. According to the statement of the junior Senator from Oregon, they perhaps are in unanimous agreement that this agency is rendering a valuable service. In addition to my holdings in Idaho I happen to be a taxpayer and a small cattle operator in the State of Oregon. I must disagree with the Senators from Oregon, and if they would like the names of some operators in Oregon, who are of the same opinion as that entertained by the junior Senator from Idaho, I shall be glad to submit them.

I know the position they are in, but I want to go on record as stating now that the views of the chairman of the Oregon Cattle Association are no different from those of the chairman of the Idaho Cattlemen's Association, of which I am a member, namely, that the Bureau of Land Management does not overlook the fact that it can lobby also at our annual State conventions of cattlemen which I attended last year, and the year before, and the years previous to that. The Bureau of Land Management does a pretty heavy job of selling this thing to the cattle growers of my State, through pressure.

I can do nothing in opposition to this bill, which is sponsored by the senior Senator from Oregon, but I promise to join with the junior Senator from Nevada to the extent of seeing whether or not the numerous complaints I am getting from cattle- and sheep growers in the State of Idaho are in fact justified.

I think there has been too much over-seeing, too much investigating, on the part of those in charge of this Bureau, and I am sure that when we present the facts to the senior Senator from Oregon, he will join with us; because I know that in the hearings he held in my State, at Boise, Idaho, he could not get to the grass roots of the complaints which I hear so many times in my office here in Washington.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon would not only be happy to get the results of such an investigation, but he will also be happy to join with his colleagues in making it. I hold no brief for the Bureau of Land Management, nor do I contend that it is a perfect agency; it is not. That there

can be cuts made in the appropriation for it, I think there is no question. But, Mr. President, in the time the committee had—and every minute of it was utilized—we cut where we thought we could cut. In the last analysis, I cannot stand on the floor of the Senate and say to my colleagues that I know I am right, and that I know they are wrong; I do not. I cannot prove that my judgment is sound, nor would I attempt to prove, by any type of proof which would be acceptable to a logical mind, that theirs is unsound. It rests, at last, in judgment.

I do want to say to my colleagues that most of us who have served on the committee come from the West. We are involved with the philosophy of the West. We want to see the West contribute to the national interest to the extent of its ability, and we want the West to be prosperous in its own right. This appropriation is our best judgment. If it be not good judgment, then it is up to the Senate to make the decision.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, before he takes his seat?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, earlier in the day, in discussing this matter, I pointed out that the receipts from timber sales, that is, the O. & C. and Coos Bay timber sales, which amounted to \$4,005,608.92 in 1950, had increased in 1951 to \$7,500,000, and that it is now estimated that there will be another increase of at least \$1,000,000 in 1952. The amendment we are now discussing is directed wholly toward a reduction of the personnel to operate and manage the timber sales on these lands. The result of such a cut would not be to save money, but would be to reduce the revenue of the Government and reduce the amount of timber which is so vitally needed in the present situation for the national defense.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Wyoming is absolutely correct.

Mr. President, I regret the Senator from Michigan is not now in the Chamber. I do not want to be thought at all critical of his efforts to reduce these appropriations. I, too, want to reduce them wherever it can be properly done. In these particular cases, I think some of us perhaps have had more experience in the field, and to that extent perhaps our judgment differs, and perhaps ought to be followed because it is based on more information. I believe the effort to reduce the cost of Government must go on; and, because I happen to stand here now in opposition to this particular amendment, I do not want my position to be misunderstood for one minute by anyone. I want to cut appropriations to the bone wherever it is appropriate to do so. But, Mr. President, when it comes to the point where I am causing the people of the United States to pay for my mistakes in attempted economy, I balk; and when I call attention to this timber-management item, I simply say—and I make this statement categorically; and here is one place where, if necessary, I can submit the proof and give

demonstrative evidence, if it is desired—that if we make the reduction proposed in this instance the people of the United States will pay in dollars for every single dollar of reduction; and it may be several dollars, up to five, or more. That is not economy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the committee amendment. The yeas-and-nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent because of illness.

I announce that on this vote the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] has a general pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations has a general pair on this vote with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation.

On this vote the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—24

Bricker	Hendrickson	Saltonstall
Bridges	Ives	Schoeppel
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Kem	Taft
Capehart	Lodge	Thye
Dirksen	Malone	Welker
Douglas	Moody	Wherry
Ferguson	O'Connor	Williams

NAYS—51

Aiken	Hennings	McClellan
Butler, Nebr.	Hill	McFarland
Cain	Hoyer	McKellar
Carlson	Holland	Millikin
Case	Humphrey	Monroney
Chavez	Hunt	Morse
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Mundt
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Dworschak	Johnston, S. C.	Nixon
Eastland	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Eaton	Kilgore	Pastore
Ellender	Knowland	Robertson
Flanders	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Frear	Lehman	Stennis
Fulbright	Long	Underwood
George	Magnuson	Watkins
Hayden	McCarthy	Young

NOT VOTING—21

Anderson	Green	Murray
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Russell
Benton	Kefauver	Smathers
Brewster	Martin	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Maybank	Sparkman
Duff	McCarran	Tobey
Gillette	McMahon	Wiley

So Mr. FERGUSON's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 8, beginning in line 10. There is a limitation of debate which now takes effect.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment passed over.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, after the semicolon in line 8, it is proposed to strike out "\$43,600,000," and insert "\$41,180,000, of which not to exceed \$23,699,661, shall be available for personal services."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that amendment was passed over at the request of the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and he has an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah to the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, line 8, it is proposed to delete the numerals "\$41,180,000" and insert the numerals "\$41,324,750."

On page 12, line 9, delete the numerals "\$23,699,661" and insert the numerals "\$23,751,661."

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, did the Senator from Arizona contact the Bureau of the Budget with respect to this amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. I did. I was advised by the Director of the Budget that he did not know at the time the budget was made up all the facts with reference to the subject; that the information was not made available to the Budget Bureau at that time, and, therefore, the lesser amount was suggested.

Mr. WATKINS. The reason I ask the question is that a number of Senators asked about that matter when we had it up before, and I checked and found that that is correct. The Bureau of the Budget would have recommended this amount so that the school could be operated to capacity.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is what the Director said. There will be no increase in overhead. It will simply result in taking care of a larger number of Navaho Indian children who will be sent there to learn to read, write, and speak the English language.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Does this relate only to the Navajo Indians or to the Indians in all States?

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me say it relates only to the one school in Utah.

Mr. HAYDEN. The school was a former Government hospital in southern Utah which was turned over to the Indian Service and made into a school where the Navajo Indians may be prepared for civilized life.

Mr. THYE. If the amount requested is not granted there will be a number of children who will not be admitted for such educational training?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. Space is now available in the dormitories for the additional children. The number of teachers will not be increased. The number of schools will not be increased. It is simply a proposal to take care of a larger number of children.

Mr. THYE. In other words, it represents an expense in connection with the dormitories, to make available facilities in which the Indian pupils may live while attending school?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. And if the appropriation is not made, it will result in reducing the number of Indian children who may be admitted yearly.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I may explain to the Senator that there are now more than 12,000 Navajo Indian children of school age who cannot go to school because the necessary facilities are not available. By the establishment of this school and others, we have been attempting to obtain the necessary facilities to take care of these children. Adoption of this proposal will mean that at least 150 more Indian children can go to this school. The school already has 2,000 pupils in it, but it has a capacity of 2,150. The extra money will make it possible for at least 150 more children to go to this school. In view of the treaty our Government has with the Navajo Indians, it seems a shame that we cannot furnish them with necessary educational facilities, one schoolroom and one teacher for 30 students. Throughout the years we have not done so. Here we have a school which can be put to use to its full capacity by means of the proposed appropriation. Had the facility been finished in time, provision for the appropriation would have been made. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I notice that the Senator has used the per capita cost of \$965, but it has been indicated that the Bureau of the Budget said there would not be any more overhead.

Mr. WATKINS. There will be some additional overhead, because it will be necessary to feed the pupils, to buy some clothing for them and provide some transportation for them.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that, but we are now talking about overhead. That would not be overhead; that would be actual cost.

Mr. WATKINS. There will be the cost of the heating plant, and the item of general superintendence of the educational system. They will be exactly the same. But there are the additional costs per pupil. There will be the cost of taking care of these additional pupils.

Mr. FERGUSON. Where does the Senator get the figure of \$144,750?

Mr. WATKINS. The figure in the bill represents the amount necessary for 2,000 students. The amendment adds \$965 per student, for 150 extra students. The sum of \$965 is largely the cost of the care and keep for an individual student. But the more students there are the more the overhead would be cut down per student. It is less expensive per student for a large number than it would be, let us say, for a school of 500.

Mr. FERGUSON. But the Senator did not use the cut-down figure.

Mr. WATKINS. I made a statement to the Senate last Friday on that subject, and do not care to debate it at any more length. We have by treaty an obligation to take care of these Indians, and my amendment would permit us, to some extent at least, to keep our pledged word.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will not the Senator from Utah agree that under the Constitution, so far as the Indian tribes are concerned, including the Navajos, the Government has the right to enter into a treaty, into a contract, to do something for the Indian tribes, and that the Government did enter into a treaty with the Navajos directly after Lincoln's time, in the late sixties.

Mr. WATKINS. About 80 years ago.

Mr. CHAVEZ. About 80 years ago, by which the Government contracted to provide additional facilities for these poor people. If there is any tribe in the country that is entitled to fair play from Uncle Sam it is the Navajos in the western United States—Utah, Arizona, Colorado, and New Mexico. They are fine people. All they are asking by the amendment, and the Senator from Utah has this in mind, is to make it feasible to provide educational facilities for a few more poor little Navajos who are entitled to fair play from the Government.

Mr. WATKINS. I wish to point out that there are more than 12,000 who are still without any facilities whatever, notwithstanding our solemn word. It seems to me we should at least keep our agreements with these people at home, at a time when it is insisted that we help people in foreign nations.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I understand, there is no compulsory education among the Indians. What assurance are we going to have that this school will not operate in the same manner as the others on the Navajo Indian Reservation, and that the students will come and go at will?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I am glad to answer that question. This school is just a day's drive by bus from the Navajo Reservation to Brigham City, Utah. The Indian children, some 1,500 of them, came there. We have had them there for a year and a half, some of them for 2 years. Instead of trying to get away from the school we have a hard time to keep them from attempting to get in. When calls were made at the collecting stations on the reservation for these children 360 more than were allocated were ready to go. I am told at the school that very few have ever tried to get away. They do not even want to go home from the school when vacation time arrives. Tears were in the eyes of the children at the end of the school year, I am told, when they were informed they had to go home for the summer. It is a delightful school. It was converted into a school from a hospital at some extra cost. It has been prepared for the use of the students, and all we ask is to make full use of what the Congress has provided for these students, and which they have a right to use.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not correct to say that not only the children in question, but thousands of other Navajo children in the same category are willing and anxious to go to school and would do so if only Uncle Sam would provide facilities?

Mr. WATKINS. At least 12,000 of them would go tomorrow if school facilities were available for them. I am a member of the "watchdog" committee for the Navajo rehabilitation program. That is one of the reasons why I am fighting for them now, to use what has already been provided, to its limit.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WATKINS. I should rather yield the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Illinois a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not have the floor yet.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Can we not have a vote on the amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to make a few observations.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, in my position as acting minority leader, I am temporarily in charge of the time of the opposition. I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois. How much time does he wish?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to have 15 minutes.

Mr. CORDON. A total of 15 minutes is all the time under the control of the opposition. If the Senator will ask for

10 minutes of the time under my control, he perhaps can obtain some more time from the other side.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have been yielded 10 minutes by the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has control of the time on the part of the opposition, if the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is not opposed to the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am not opposed to it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall not address myself to this particular amendment, but rather rise in the spirit of protest against some of the expenditures in this bureau. I remember the days on the other side of the Capitol when appropriations for the Indian Bureau reached \$32,000,000 a year, and I made, by rule of thumb, a ready calculation which indicated that the amount appropriated represented \$1,000 for every Indian in addition to whatever social security benefits he had, and in addition to whatever other general benefits inured to him by virtue of residence in the United States of America.

Last year the budget estimate reached \$71,000,000, and if I correctly remember the figure in this bill, the appropriation is roughly \$67,000,000 for the fiscal year 1952. Of that amount, there is roughly \$23,000,000 for education. I think we are now spending \$2,300,000 for social-welfare activities, for placement, guidance, and a great many other things.

I am wondering about this kind of expenditure. It is a little startling when we realize that 13,006 civilian employees of the Government—and I should like to be corrected if I am wrong—are administering the affairs of X number of Indians. Not even that number has been determined. The Census Bureau has one rule by which it determines what constitutes an Indian. The Indian Bureau has another, and there is quite a disparity between their estimates. I think the Indian Bureau insists that there are 393,000 Indians in the country. The Census Bureau says, roughly, 333,000.

Some years ago I had this rather entrancing experience: I sent a letter to the Indian Bureau. I simply said to Mr. John Collier, who was at that time at the head of that activity, "What is an Indian?" I got back four pages of single-spaced typewriting, and when I got through I could not find out what an Indian was.

I addressed a letter to the Bureau of the Census. I got back five pages. To this good hour, I do not quite know what an Indian is, although by one standard probably one-sixty-fourth blood entitles one to be on the tribal rolls. By that standard the second Mrs. Woodrow Wilson would have been enrolled upon the rolls of the Indian Bureau; and if numbers mean anything for the purpose of getting anything out of Congress, that is a very felicitous way to do it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield, although I have but little time to labor this matter.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree completely with the statement of the Senator from Illinois that the appropriation is not in keeping with the welfare of the Indians.

In the instance of the present appropriation, my only interest is to do something for the Indian, and not for the Indian Bureau. I have seen the Bureau grow from an appropriation of \$22,000,000 a year in 1931, to an appropriation of \$71,000,000 last year.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not take too much of my time, because my time is limited.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let us cut the Indian Bureau, but let us not sacrifice the Indians.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I sometimes wonder earnestly—and I yield to no one in my solicitude for the aboriginal inhabitants of this country—whether we would not be infinitely better off if we were to abolish the Indian Bureau.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think we would.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the record before the committee is not too happy a one in this connection. Let me read what the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] said. Perhaps he is a member of the committee. This was with relation to education. There is \$23,000,000 in this item for education. The Senator from California said:

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to interrupt the speaker, but we are now in the year 1951. Is it not a rather sad commentary—and this is not personal, because you have only fairly recently come into the picture—but is it not a sad commentary with the years and generations that have passed that we have had some responsibility for and to the Indians of this country that we now find some of them handicapped in getting employment because they cannot speak the English language?

There was an Indian Bureau in 1824. That was 127 years ago. It was under the direction of the Army. It was transferred to the Interior Department, such as it was, in 1849, or 102 years ago.

When we read this record we see the allergy of these people toward work, and toward the idea of being assimilated and absorbed. When we are now spending nearly \$2,000 a year per Indian, frankly, it is time to call a halt and take a look at this problem. I think the situation ought to be investigated from top to bottom. There are in this service 13,006 civilian employees, or nearly 1 employee for every 30 of our Indian wards. There is something wrong with that picture. I want to see the right thing done, but I do not want to see money wasted.

In my time I have seen this Bureau grow from an appropriation of \$30,000,000 to an appropriation of \$70,000,000, and this year \$67,000,000. It seems to me that the subject eminently deserves a far better exploration than it has received. I do not pretend to be an expert on the subject. I do not pretend to have the answers. I know that those who come from the Western States and the Northwestern States probably have lived with this problem for a long time, and have a more intimate knowledge of it and greater familiarity with it than have I.

But how long is this thing to go on? Recognizing, of course, that the Indians are the wards of the Government, recognizing that in certain cases there are treaty obligations to the Indians, that still is no warrant, and certainly no jus-

tification, for wasting money, if there is waste in this bill. We are getting perilously close to that time. I am beginning to wonder about it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to have the time taken out of whatever time may be allotted to me, if necessary.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I merely wish to say to the Senator, first of all, that there is another study of Indian problems now in process by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Many studies have been made in the past, which has not been productive, sad to say, of too great results. But the fact of the matter is that by way of education we are doing more than can be done, I think, in any other way to bring the Indian population of the United States to a better realization of the opportunities which are presented to them.

The record of the last war shows that Indians have been subject to military duty and have performed that duty with great credit to themselves and to the country. The record of defense mobilization during World War II shows, throughout the country, that Indians have been employed in industrial establishments, and to great advantage. In recent years there has been a substantial degree of progress.

There are many, many errors in the administration of Indian affairs. I have no doubt about that. But with respect to education, it certainly is an obligation which the Congress of the United States owes to the aboriginal inhabitants of this continent. I assure the Senator that if the will and desire of the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will bring it about, the study which is now in progress will result in a report upon which the Congress may act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair). The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired, unless the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] yields additional time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Frankly, time was supposed to be made available to me by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has 7 minutes.

Mr. WATKINS. I shall be glad to yield some of that time to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator from Utah yield 5 minutes to me in order that I may respond to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes additional to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to respond for a moment to my friend from Wyoming.

The question in my mind is this: How long is this type of wardship to go on? It has been in process now for well over

a century and a quarter. In the House report the following statement is made:

Although recognizing the necessity to provide material assistance, the committee feels that the increasing emphasis must be placed upon active, tangible progress toward the assimilation of Indians into the general population.

Is this to go on for another 50 years? Is it to go on for another 100 years? Will the appropriations reach \$100,000,000 a year?

I know something about the ravages of disease, and I have some doubt as to whether there is quite the increase in the Indian population which has been asserted by the Indian Bureau. I would much rather take the Census Bureau figures.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I answer the Senator?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe that some attention ought to be paid to this load. It is not fair to the country and to the taxpayers to carry a burden like this when we fail, evidently, in the job of assimilation. We fail in the job of education. Furthermore, the committee hearings—and I have read every word on the subject of the Indian Bureau—are certainly not very encouraging in respect of the assimilation of Indians into working activities. I believe we have a right to ask that they overcome their allergy toward employment and that something be done toward facilitating their adjustment. If they are able-bodied, they should carry their load, just like anyone else.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will permit me—

Mr. DIRKSEN. First I yield to my friend from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. The vocational school covered by the pending amendment is for the purpose of training the Indians, so that they will be able to take jobs. These particular Indians, the Navajos, are very fine mechanics when trained and they become good workers, but they must be taught the English language first.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Do they stay at the job, or do they go back to the blanket on the reservation? The testimony before the committee indicated that there were some persons who counseled the Indians that they should stay on the reservation, instead of going outside and finding useful employment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the fault of the Bureau. The Bureau people would like to keep them on the reservation, in order to perpetuate their own jobs. They would like to keep them where the Senator from Illinois says they are being kept.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator from New Mexico join me in striking a million and a half dollars from the appropriations for the Indian Bureau?

Mr. CHAVEZ. When I get the floor in my own time I intend to give the Senate my opinion of the Indian problem. I say that nothing is the matter with the Indian. The Indian should be left alone. He should be allowed to assimilate. I shall read the language which the committee inserted in the report. It will take only a half minute to read.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have just read the language into the RECORD.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The House report used the following language:

Although recognizing the necessity to provide material assistance, the committee feels that increasing emphasis must be placed on active, tangible progress toward the assimilation of the Indians into the general population. Unless this is done the Indians will inevitably continue in their dependent status.

The Bureau wants the Indians to remain in the dependent status.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have heard such assertions made for 12, 15, or 16 years, and I have not seen any improvement. All I have seen is requests for more money, until we now have over 13,000 paid medical, educational, and enforcement officials. There is something tragically wrong with that kind of picture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CASE. Can the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WATKINS. I am glad to yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I do not need 2 minutes. I merely wish to make the observation that the prolongation of the existence of the Indian Bureau and the wardship of the Indians are not only unfair to the taxpayers, but unfair as well to the Indians themselves.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to say to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that I believe substantial progress is being made along the line which he believes the Government should follow, namely, toward the elimination of the wardship of the government of the Indians.

The chief obstacle in the path of the assimilation of the Indians into the general body of our citizenship has been the fact that through the years the Indians have had claims against the Government for what they assert to be violations of their treaty rights in the taking of their land and resources.

Several years ago, in the Seventy-ninth Congress, while I was chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs for a few brief months, I sponsored in the committee and in the Senate a bill to establish the Indian Claims Commission. The theory of the bill was that all Indian claims should be finally determined, once and for all. The law set a time limit, within which all Indian claims must be filed with the Commission, so that the Commission could dispose of them. That time limit is running out. I want the Senator from Illinois and the Senate to understand that, so far as I am concerned, I shall oppose any extension of the deadline. Let the claims be finally adjudicated. Then there will be removed the principal obstacle to the development

of the Indian, because so long as the Indian feels that he has a claim, or something to be awarded to him, he will follow the other road.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes.

Mr. WATKINS. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to take 1 minute in order to reply to the Senator from Wyoming. Let us assume that we finally come to the conclusion of the claims, and that they are all liquidated. I have seen some of the claims which have been filed. If they should be paid in full they would practically denude the Federal Treasury. All the Senator says may affect the tribal accounts, but certainly I do not believe it would make any practical difference to Congress, the way we are going, with respect to annual appropriations.

The time has arrived to come to grips with the problem and to determine that the Indians must be assimilated and that they must go outside the reservations and do some work. As the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has indicated, the present system is grossly unfair to the Indian himself. He is developing no self-reliance. He wants to stay on the reservation. The record is replete with evidence that he does not learn the English language and that he cannot adjust himself. If he cannot adjust himself, and if he cannot find a job, he will continue as an aggravation in the body politic.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In the case of an Indian reservation which has been set aside by treaty between the Government of the United States and an Indian tribe it is utterly impossible to follow the proposal offered by the Senator from Illinois. It is a problem which must be worked out gradually.

Mr. WATKINS. I may say that this amendment represents an honest effort to put the Indians on their own. We must take the Indians tribe by tribe. We have established a school. The buildings were formerly occupied by an army hospital. It can accommodate 2,150 Indians, if filled to capacity. The Indians are being trained so that they can leave the reservation and live somewhere else. They must do so, because there are not enough resources on the reservation to take care of all of them. As a matter of fact, half of the Indians, or some 30,000 of them, must be moved from the reservation. A replacement program is being worked out under which they will be taken off the reservation as fast as they can understand the English language and are able to take care of themselves.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator realize that there are Indians, graduates of Carlisle College in Pennsylvania, on reservations today who are in the same position as Indians who have no education?

Mr. WATKINS. That is true. The reason for it is largely because only a few Indians are educated. We must have mass education to get any effect in that respect. One or two went back to the blankets in a hurry.

Mr. FERGUSON. Why did they not leave the reservation? Was it the fault of the Bureau?

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. This is an honest effort to get the Indians on their own feet. Congress voted unanimously to establish the school and transferred it to the Indian Bureau. We voted \$3,750,000 to build it. Why should we recede now and cut the appropriation down \$150,000, merely because there is an economy wave? It is a matter of contract, as well, that we should keep.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes.

Mr. CASE. I beg the pardon of the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Michigan for interrupting them. I believe the answer is that the emphasis which has been followed under the Indian Reorganization Act has been to keep the Indian an Indian. Until the emphasis is changed that will be the effect of the Bureau's policy. Personally I have been somewhat encouraged by the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs. He is a gentleman who is disposed, more than anyone I have ever met in the Bureau, to get away from maintaining the Indian as an Indian on a reservation.

Mr. WATKINS. This is an honest effort to get the Indians off the reservation as fast as they come out of school and are able to carry on for themselves.

Mr. CASE. A program of taking them off the reservations must be the answer to the Indian problem.

Mr. WATKINS. I have asked for \$500,000. What did Congress do? While Congress wants to get them off the reservation, it has cut off the money for that purpose. I did not make any argument for the \$500,000, but it should have been made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair). The time of the Senator from Utah has expired. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah to the committee amendment on page 12, in line 8.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. HAYDEN obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will my colleague yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I simply wish to say, regarding the committee amendment, that it provides for a percentage cut in regard to the appropriations for the health, education, and welfare services of the Indians. What has been said in regard to what the Bureau of Indian Affairs has done and what it has not done has been interesting; but I simply wish to say that if perhaps in the past the Government has not fulfilled

its obligations to the Indians, at least we are not relieved from the obligation of fulfilling our responsibilities to them.

Poor Indians are living in certain areas in hogans, and many of them do not understand the English language and do not know how to get a job. We have tried to obtain the enactment of laws which would permit them to obtain off-the-reservation employment. We would like to have established in the towns schools which the Indians could attend, learn the English language, and commingle with the white people. However, that cannot be done if we reduce the appropriations.

The second part of this committee amendment, providing that "not to exceed \$23,699,661 shall be available for personal services," may be all right, for it would reduce the personnel of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. However, when the conferees take the amendment to conference, I hope they will not agree to reduce the appropriation that is needed for the education and welfare of the Indians and to help them obtain good jobs in other places.

Senators speak of having the States assume the obligations for the Indians. The States will be glad to assume the social-security obligation and every other obligation for the Indians as soon as the Indians are put on their feet, so that they can cope with the white men by their side. We are making rapid strides in that direction. We are trying to obtain off-the-reservation employment for the Indians. There are programs calling for the establishment of schools for the Indians, and also programs to allow the Indians to attend the regular schools for the white people.

So I hope the committee of conference will restore the allowance of \$43,600,000, even if they maintain the limitation of \$23,699,661 for personal services. Mr. President, if we are going to do our duty by our own people, we must make this appropriation. We cannot make meat-tax cuts in the appropriations available for the education and welfare of poor people and then expect to rehabilitate them at the same time.

Where did the committee get this reduced appropriation? It simply decided on a straight cut in the appropriation, regardless of whether these poor people need the money or not.

I say we should hang our heads in shame if we do not take care of these poor, dependent Indians who cannot speak English.

It is said that they are able-bodied. Yes; perhaps they are able-bodied; but how can they get jobs if they cannot speak the English language?

I simply wish to make this statement in behalf of the Indians of my State, and there are many of them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the junior Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask a question.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask whether the item in the appropriation bill providing for grants and assistance to needy Indians applies universally to every State where there are Indians. I ask that question because I was under the impression that certain States are given assistance by way of grants for social-security purposes, but other States are not. This matter was brought to my attention by the Bureau of Public Welfare of my State of Minnesota.

Mr. HAYDEN. I can answer that question. The situation with which we are now dealing arises in connection with special legislation which was passed for the benefit of the Navajo and Hopi Indians. The Senator recalls that there were very heavy snowstorms in the area where the Navajos and Hopis live, and there was starvation on the reservation. A cry went up to the effect that if we can take care of persons in foreign countries, we should be able to take care of our own. Therefore, special legislation in that connection was enacted.

That legislation was enacted because of the fact that the Navajos and Hopis are the largest tribes of Indians that are living on lands which really are not sufficient to support them. There are approximately 60,000 Navajos and Hopis on that reservation, but the reservation will not support more than half that number. As a result, they had to receive assistance, which is not granted elsewhere.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I asked the question because certain counties in Minnesota have a very heavy public-relief load brought about by the number of Indians and the small number of jobs available in the area.

Does this item provide assistance for the State of Minnesota in that connection?

Mr. HAYDEN. Some general relief is provided; I am sure it is not restricted to the particular counties. That matter is covered under the title of the bill relating to health, education, and welfare; it covers all those purposes.

However, I would not want to tell the Senator from Minnesota that the bill provides a special fund which would be available to the counties of his State, because such is not provided in the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is my feeling that if we are going to give the kind of special treatment which is given to some areas—and I am not saying that is not right—certainly we should give the same kind of treatment to other areas where the counties have taken on a tremendous public-assistance load. If we can do that, I should like to know when it will be accomplished.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. This appropriation applies to the general welfare of all Indians, and the appropriation could be used in one State as well as in another.

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 12, in line 8, as

amended by the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I was going to state—

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this amendment was passed over at the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; and the question will be on agreeing to my amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; the Senator from Michigan has an amendment of his own pending to the committee amendment, and it should be considered now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment passed over will be stated.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 13, line 7, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$12,000,000" and insert "\$11,683,104, of which not to exceed \$2,852,067 shall remain available for personal services, and."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, to this committee amendment, I call up my amendment identified as "7-6-51-J", on page 13, in line 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 13, in line 8, it is proposed to strike out "\$11,683,104" and insert "\$10,000,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this particular item is the construction item for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The budget estimate for it was \$12,000,000. The bill as it is now before us implies that the House voted the full amount of the budget estimate, namely, \$12,000,000. However, what the House really did was to provide a lump-sum or over-all limitation of \$65,000,000. If the House had actually voted to allow the full amount of the budget estimate for each of the several items which make up the appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the amount voted by the House for this purpose would have been the amount of the budget estimate, or \$71,425,000.

In their tentative allocations based on the House limitation, the representatives of the Bureau testified that if the House total were sustained, this construction item would be reduced to \$8,231,000, which, in reality, is what is in the House appropriation for this item.

As the bill was reported to the Senate by the Appropriations Committee, it carried at this point the amount of \$11,683,104. The purpose of my amendment to the committee amendment is to reduce that sum to \$10,000,000. In other words, the over-all appropriation by the House would actually be \$8,231,000; and if we take my figure of \$10,000,000, the comparison would be between that figure and the \$8,231,000, which, in effect, was allowed by the House.

Mr. President, that is one item. When we are talking about construction, I point out that construction covers the construction of buildings and utilities,

roads and trails, irrigation systems, and there is the item of land acquisition. All of these items, except the provision for the roads and trails and the land acquisition, of course, would require the use of valuable building material, and so forth, from the various military projects. If the Bureau itself says they get only \$65,000,000, they would allot \$8,231,000, whereas now they are in effect getting from this bill the \$12,000,000; and it is the purpose, as I said before, to cut this figure to \$10,000,000.

Mr. CASE. Does the Senator know how much was allotted, or planned, in the allocation of this fund, for the acquisition of land?

Mr. FERGUSON. Nothing was planned along that line. The appropriation for 1951, last year, carried an item for land acquisition, and that is why the term "land acquisition" was used, in connection with the item of \$137,500.

Mr. CASE. It occurs to me that this is a poor time for the Indian Bureau to be acquiring land, or to be adding to its holdings of land.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Bureau is applying \$1,000,000 to roads and trails, \$1,921,000 to irrigation, and \$5,310,000 to buildings and utilities; and, as I say, it amounts to giving the Bureau their breakdown of \$8,231,000. What the amendment of the Senator from Michigan would appropriate to them would be \$10,000,000, for the particular items I have designated, so that if any cut is justified, it appears that this cut of \$2,000,000 is justified, when the amount allowed is \$2,500,000 more than the amount which the House appropriated, and which was in the House bill.

Mr. CASE. Does the Senator's amendment propose to do anything to the personal-services figure?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; this amendment does not touch the personal-services item. It relates to construction.

Mr. CASE. It seems to me the amendment ought to be directed to that item, when the Senator understands that, on an Indian reservation, where the Indian Service has the responsibility for maintaining roads, there is no other agency having the duty to maintain the roads. The Indian reservation that is within an organized county, or in an unorganized county, generally speaking, has no funds for the maintenance of roads within the Indian reservation; and if the Indian Service does not have the money for improving the roads, none is available.

If the Senator's amendment would simply change the \$11,000,000 figure of the committee amendment to \$10,000,000, and still leave \$2,852,000 available for personal services, it strikes me that the proportion would be wrong; for the committee has said that, of the \$11,683,104, \$2,852,067 should be available for personal services. If the Senator changes the total figure, reducing it from \$11,683,104 to \$10,000,000, and still leaves the personal-services figure at \$2,852,067, then the personal-services figure would be out of proportion to the total.

Mr. FERGUSON. The language is "not to exceed." There is a provision in

the report indicating that when construction, or the various personal-service items are reduced, the other items are not to be increased in connection with personal service.

Mr. CASE. But that is not the way the Bureau now interprets it. It is not a total limitation; it is a reservation of that much for personal services, that is to say, "of which not to exceed \$2,852,067 shall be available for personal services"; and, under the interpretation of the Bureau and of the Comptroller General, it reserves that much out of the total for personal services.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no doubt they could use that full amount.

Mr. CASE. If we were to reserve for personal services \$2,800,000 of the \$10,000,000, it would be a wrong proportion. Certainly, if the Senator is going to reduce the \$11,000,000 figure to \$10,000,000, he should reduce the personal-service item.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is very difficult to ascertain how much of the \$11,683,104 would be for personal services.

Mr. CASE. I wonder, though, whether the Senator would not want to modify his amendment to say that "of which not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be available for personal services." Certainly we ought not to give them the same amount for personal services as we would if the appropriation were 16 percent larger.

Mr. FERGUSON. In this particular amendment, of course, there is no specific amount for personal services. It is listed as construction, and the committee cut the amount for personal services by 10 percent.

Mr. CASE. Yes, but that was based on \$12,000,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is on the basis of \$12,000,000.

Mr. CASE. But the Senator's amendment would let them spend exactly as much for personal services, namely, \$2,800,000 on a lower basis, that is, out of \$10,000,000. In other words, the committee proposes to let them spend \$2,800,000 for personal services out of the \$11,600,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. The committee did that on the same basis on which it was willing to allow them to use \$12,000,000.

Mr. CASE. But why, if the Senator wants to press his amendment, would he not knock down the \$2,800,000 for personal services, and leave a little more for actual construction?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan feels that, if they will really make a 10 percent cut, the result will be practically the same whether they figure on the amount of \$11,683,104, or \$10,000,000. It will cut down the amount for construction, in the actual operation of that particular item, by \$1,683,104.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota would like to offer an amendment to the Senator's amendment, to reduce the personal-services item. As I understand, however, such an amendment would be in the third degree.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is true.

Mr. CASE. The Senator's amendment is already an amendment to an amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not think the Senator from Michigan can accept such an amendment. He believes it would be an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. CASE. Certainly the Senator from South Dakota, for himself, cannot say that the Senator could accept the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, let me explain the situation. The reduction of 10 percent, through the action taken by the Senate, was based on the principle that the budget estimate, whatever it might be for this purpose, should be reduced 10 percent. When we reduce the amount shown in the budget for personal services by 10 percent, the figure reported by the committee is the amount which is left, that is to say, \$2,852,067, which is 90 percent of the budget estimate for personal services.

Mr. CASE. Ninety percent of the \$12,000,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. CASE. Ninety percent of the estimate for personal services?

Mr. HAYDEN. That had nothing to do with it. If the Senator will consider the situation as it actually exists, he will recall that the Committee on Appropriations was instructed by the Senate to reduce the budget estimate for personal services by 10 percent. What the amount for construction would be has nothing to do with that reduction. We are cutting personal services 10 percent. The committee has carried out the instructions of the Senate. That is all we have done. There is no relation between that and anything else.

Mr. CASE. But the Senator from Arizona will agree with me that if \$2,800,000 is the proper item for personal services, out of a total construction fund of \$11,600,000, it is too much if we are going to reduce the total construction item from \$11,600,000 to an even \$10,000,000. Is not that true?

Mr. HAYDEN. That would be true if it were not based upon the total amount to start with. We are not cutting the personal services appropriation in relation to operation and maintenance work.

Mr. CASE. But it comes out of the \$11,600,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. It certainly does, but it comes out of the budget estimate.

Mr. CASE. If the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan prevails, \$2,800,000 would be taken from the \$10,000,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. It remains the same.

Mr. CASE. But there would be less money left for actual construction.

Mr. HAYDEN. Not necessarily.

Mr. CASE. The \$2,800,000 could not be used for anything except personal services.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Michigan did not make clear the fact that last year there was appropriated for construction \$19,137,650. The Bureau of the Budget reduced that amount to \$12,000,000, and we have made the 10-percent reduction in personal services, which reduces the amount recommended to \$11,600,000, in round figures. Of that sum, as stated in the bill, approximately \$3,125,000 is for the liquida-

tion of obligations under previous contract authorizations.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. Following up the question asked by the Senator from South Dakota, since we have already allocated \$3,125,000, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee why \$2,000,000 is still needed for personal services.

Mr. HAYDEN. To liquidate the obligations, and to do the work which the Bureau of the Budget estimated would cost a certain amount.

Mr. FREAR. Five percent of the \$3,000,000 would amount to only \$150,000, which is a very small amount compared with the \$2,852,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Within the budget estimate of \$12,000,000 there was an estimate by the Bureau of \$3,168,000 for personal services. The Budget Bureau estimated that it would require that much to pay the personnel necessary to do the work. We cut that item 10 percent as directed by the Senate.

Mr. FREAR. Then I would assume that the Budget Bureau took into consideration that the \$3,125,000 would not require excessive administration expenses.

Mr. HAYDEN. It took into consideration what personnel was necessary.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The effect of the language proposed in the committee amendment, "of which not to exceed \$2,852,067 shall be available for personal services," is equivalent to earmarking that much money for personal services. The Senator will not disagree with that statement, will he?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. CASE. When we say that \$2,852,067 shall be available for personal services, we have earmarked that amount, and it cannot be available for any other purpose.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. The Bureau of the Budget estimated that \$3,168,000 would be required for personal services to enable the Bureau to do the kind of work contemplated and scheduled. That is the basis on which the committee acted. The Senate decided that they could get along with 10 percent less.

Mr. CASE. I accept that statement, there is no quarrel with it; but I insist that the effect of the language is that we have earmarked two things—\$3,125,000 for the liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted, and we have earmarked the sum of \$2,852,067 for personal services. When we add those two sums together we get \$5,977,067. If we subtract that from \$11,683,104, we have left, under the language of the Senate committee amendment, \$5,706,037. Under the language proposed by the Senator from Michigan we would have left only \$4,023,000 for construction.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The error in the Senator's conclusion is that what we set

as a ceiling for personal services and a ceiling for liquidation is a floor for each. The words "not to exceed" make it a ceiling, and the mandatory word "shall" places a limitation on the total amount that can be spent for the purpose. It is not in any sense a requirement that the money be spent exclusively for that purpose.

Mr. HAYDEN. I entirely agree with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CASE. I also agree. But not more than that amount can be expended for personal services. It is earmarked, "put on ice," and set aside, and not to exceed that much shall be available for personal services. I am confident that future interpretation of that language will bear me out that that much money is set aside for personal services.

I further submit that if we want to earmark a certain amount of money for the liquidation of obligations, we should say, "Not to exceed so much is for liquidation of obligations." We have earmarked that much money, and it must be preserved for that purpose. We have earmarked a certain amount of money for personal services, and we have reserved that amount for personal services. We thereby reduce construction money by that amount.

Mr. HAYDEN. I cannot follow the Senator's argument. The Bureau of the Budget made an estimate of \$3,168,000 for personal services. It set forth in the estimate that it could not be used for anything else.

Mr. CORDON. I think I follow the Senator's statement. I have no information on the subject, but I think the Senator is correct that perhaps the General Accounting Office has rendered a decision that such language would set up a contingent use which would effect a reservation of that amount from any other use. If that kind of an opinion has been rendered by the Comptroller General, then at the appropriate time, in conference, the language needs to be changed. It was not the intent of the committee to do that. The language, I submit to any lawyer, does not so provide; but if the Comptroller General says it does, then we can ask the Comptroller General to choose some language that suits him.

Mr. CASE. I am sure the Senator is familiar with the work of Marcellus C. Shield. Every time we wanted to earmark a certain amount in a fund for a particular purpose, it was his custom to write language providing that a certain amount should be available for a specific purpose.

Mr. HAYDEN. When he earmarked a certain sum of money, he did not use the words "not to exceed," but he said "of which so much shall be available."

Mr. CASE. Either way, I think the effect would be the same.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; it makes a vast difference.

Mr. CASE. It would be available for that purpose.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think there is universal agreement in the committee

that when the words "of which not to exceed" are used, the interpretation is that it is purely a limitation.

Mr. CASE. I agree that it is a limitation.

Mr. FERGUSON. That the amount that is not used will revert to the Treasury, and that under no circumstances can more than that be used. So it becomes a ceiling.

Mr. CASE. It becomes a ceiling. That is perfectly clear.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. If it were desired to make it mandatory, then there would be left out the language "of which not to exceed \$2,852,067 shall be available," and so forth.

Mr. CASE. Certainly not more than that can be used, but up to that amount can be used. If it is not used, it is not usable.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, speaking in whatever time may be yielded to me by whomsoever may yield it—and it will not take me long to conclude my remarks—I should like to suggest that I am inclined to believe, directing my statement to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who has had vast experience in the field of appropriations on the other side of the Capitol, and whose opinion merits most careful consideration by the Senate, that if the interpretation which the Senator has placed upon this language should be the interpretation which the Comptroller General places upon it, then if we were to adopt the House language with reference to this whole appropriation, the House having made a single appropriation of approximately six-million-and-some dollars less than the total budget estimate, and then with respect to each of the items of appropriation included used the term "not to exceed" and then used the figures of the budget estimate, the Comptroller General would be face to face with an interpretation requiring an impossibility to the extent of a deficiency of \$6,500,000, because the rest could not be applied.

Mr. CASE. That is perfectly proper.

Mr. CORDON. I rather doubt that the event will show that that kind of an interpretation has been made. Where the words "not to exceed" are not used I am quite sure that would be the rule. But I am strongly of the opinion that the Comptroller General will follow the general legal interpretation in connection with a matter of this kind, and that the words of statutory presentation will prevail.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if there is no further discussion, I wish to express the hope that the amendment will be defeated. The matter will, however, have to go to conference, and there we will endeavor to adjust it as best we can. I think it would be a mistake to adopt the amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator suggest that he take the matter to conference?

Mr. HAYDEN. We will have the committee amendment in conference between the House and the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. The difference between the amount in the House bill of \$12,000,000 and the amount recommend-

ed by the committee of \$11,683,104, will be in conference. There is no way by which the conference committee can reduce the amount to \$10,000,000. They cannot even reduce it to the amount the House thought it was providing by its overall cut.

Mr. HAYDEN. No. Let me repeat that the House had no thought on that subject at all. The House took what we considered to be a wrong action. They made an arbitrary \$6,500,000 cut. The apportionment of that cut was not made by the House of Representatives.

Mr. FERGUSON. No, it was made by the Bureau.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Bureau, faced with a cut of that size, decided to whack it off wherever it could. It did not agree to it, and the House had no knowledge of where it would be applied. That is why the Senate committee deliberately decided that we would make our own cuts in the proper places, and not leave it to the discretion of a bureau chief as to where he would place the money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The time of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has expired. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. It occurs to me, Mr. President, that we are going to be in rather an anomalous position in conference on this bill, because the language referring to the availability of money not to exceed a certain sum certainly means anything from that amount down to nothing.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. Therefore, inasmuch as the House made an appropriation of \$65,000,000, the difference between that and the total budget request of \$71,425,000 being approximately \$6,500,000, it seems to me the House would be in the position of saying, and with some real reason, that they were entitled to vary any item either below the figure they used as an allocation of the budget estimate, or our figure which we use as an appropriation, so long as the total of those variances does not go beyond the total to which they have held their single figure of appropriation.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no question about that, because first the conference will have to determine whether or not the ceiling of \$65,000,000 shall be maintained. If it is maintained, the matter is wide open to any change below that. If it is not maintained, the conferees can then make any change they please, anywhere through the entire appropriation for the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think we should place this figure beyond any doubt at \$10,000,000, so there will be in conference the item of \$12,000,000 approved by the House and \$10,000,000 by the Senate. Then the question of the interpretation will be eliminated.

Mr. President, on my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested. Is the request sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan, designated 7-6-51-J. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is requested.

Mr. FERGUSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	McKellar
Bricker	Hennings	Millikin
Bridges	Hill	Monroney
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Moody
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Morse
Byrd	Humphrey	Mundt
Cain	Hunt	Neely
Capehart	Ives	Nixon
Carlson	Jenner	O'Connor
Case	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Cordon	Kerr	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Lehman	Stennis
Ecton	Lodge	Taft
Ellender	Long	Thye
Ferguson	Magnuson	Underwood
Flanders	Malone	Watkins
Frear	McCarthy	Welker
Fulbright	McClellan	Wherry
George	McFarland	Williams
Hayden		Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment on page 13, line 8.

Mr. FERGUSON and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent because of illness.

I announce that on this vote the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON]

has a general pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

I announce that on this vote the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

I announce that on this vote the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay" and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations has a general pair on this vote with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation, and is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—40

Aiken	Ferguson	O'Connor
Bricker	Flanders	Pastore
Bridges	Frear	Robertson
Butler, Md.	George	Saltonstall
Butler, Nebr.	Hendrickson	Schoeppel
Byrd	Hoey	Smith, Maine
Cain	Holland	Smith, N. C.
Capehart	Ives	Taft
Carlson	Jenner	Thye
Dirksen	Kerr	Welker
Douglas	Kilgore	Wherry
Dworshak	Knowland	Williams
Eastland	Langer	
Ecton	Lehman	
	Long	
	Magnuson	
	McClellan	
	McFarland	
	McCarthy	
	Moody	

NAYS—35

Case	Johnson, Tex.	Millikin
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Monroney
Clements	Kerr	Morse
Cordon	Kilgore	Mundt
Ellender	Knowland	Neely
Fulbright	Langer	Nixon
Hayden	Lehman	O'Mahoney
Hennings	Long	Stennis
Hill	Magnuson	Underwood
Humphrey	McClellan	Watkins
Hunt	McFarland	Young
Johnson, Colo.	McKellar	

NOT VOTING—21

Anderson	Green	Murray
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Russell
Benton	Kefauver	Smathers
Brewster	Martin	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Maybank	Sparkman
Duff	McCarran	Tobey
Gillette	McMahon	Wiley

So Mr. FERGUSON's amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 13, in line 8, as amended.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have an amendment to this committee amendment at another point. Is it in order at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 13, in line 8, it is proposed to strike out "\$2,852,067" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,500,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment, as amended.

The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it will not be necessary for me to take 15 minutes.

If Senators will examine the bill on page 13, they will note that as the committee amendment now stands, as a result of the adoption of the amendment submitted to it by the Senator from Michigan, the figure \$11,683,104 has been reduced to an even \$10,000,000. My amendment proposes that the following figure be reduced; I refer to the figure in the same line, which applies to personal services. My amendment to the amended committee amendment would reduce the amount allowed for the personal services item from \$2,852,067 to \$2,500,000.

It is my contention that at the present time the amendment as it would now stand would earmark \$2,852,067 to be available for personal services, plus \$3,125,000, in line 10, for liquidation of prior obligations.

Although the total amount reported by the committee, namely, \$11,683,104, is now to be reduced to \$10,000,000, as will be done as a result of the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment, yet the committee amendment as thus amended, but without the adoption of my amendment, would provide \$2,852,067 for personal services.

Since the total amount is to be reduced as the result of the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment, it is my contention that the amount to be appropriated for personal services should be reduced in proportion. Roughly, the reduction made as a result of the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment is 10 percent, or \$1,683,104, being a reduction from \$11,683,104 to

\$10,000,000. Similarly, a rough 10-percent reduction of the \$2,852,067 would result in a figure of approximately \$2,500,000.

So my amendment to the committee amendment, as amended, simply would match, in this case, the reduction made by the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment. It is my purpose to make sure that some funds are allowed so that the job to which the amendment applies can really be done. After all, the appropriation is for the construction and repair of roads on Indian reservations and the construction, repair, and maintenance of buildings there. This fund will be the only fund available for those purposes. Therefore, let us not permit all the amount to be spent for personal services, but let us try to provide that some of the fund will be available for new construction and for the repair and improvement of existing construction. This paragraph of the bill also allows certain funds for the liquidation of prior obligations.

So let us not permit all the fund to be used for personal services, but let us provide that some of the fund shall be used for the repair and painting of buildings and for fixing up the roads, so that these people can get around.

So, Mr. President, I hope my amendment to the committee amendment, as amended, will be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is recognized, if he wishes to resist the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I merely wish to explain to the Senate that there is no relationship between the limitation and the amount of money available in this case, because the limitation, made under the directive given to the Appropriations Committee by the Senate, was a 10-percent reduction of the Budget estimate, and that is what the committee made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator accept the amendment to the amendment and take it to conference?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator could accept the amendment and take it to conference, and then find from the Bureau the proper ratio.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senate established the ratio, which was that we should reduce by 10 percent the budget estimates for personal services. The committee obeyed that direction.

Mr. FERGUSON. But now that the Senate has voted that a further cut be made in the \$12,000,000 item, namely, a cut to \$10,000,000, instead of to \$11,683,104, as reported by the committee, it is the theory of the Senator from South Dakota that a cut should also be made in the amount provided for personal services. I would agree with him if I knew the exact amount in accordance with the ratio.

So if the Senator from Arizona will accept this amendment to the amended

committee amendment, and will take it to conference, the ratio can then be determined from the Bureau.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I disagree that the words "not to exceed" do not mean anything. However, under the circumstances, I accept the amendment to the committee amendment, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended, on page 13, in lines 7 to 9.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment lettered "A."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, let me inquire on what page of the bill that item is to be found.

Mr. DOUGLAS. On page 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that before that point in the bill is reached, the Senate must consider certain committee amendments which previously were passed over and have not yet been disposed of.

The Senator from Arizona will be recognized to bring up the next committee amendment passed over.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President—

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if my colleague will yield, let me say that it was my understanding that when we reached the items for the Bureau of Reclamation we would not proceed further with the bill this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not understand the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am about to make a motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

However, first, I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

PRESENT PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record, as a part of my remarks, a very able statement made by Mr. Edgar W. Smith, president of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, before the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives, at the Multnomah Hotel, Portland, Oreg., on July 5, 1951. In the address Mr. Smith discussed what the Senators from Oregon have pointed out, on more than one occasion in the Senate, constitutes an unfair discrimination against the great Pacific Northwest by this administration in respect to the letting of Government contracts in connection with the defense programs to business concerns in the Pacific Northwest.

In the interest of saving time, I ask unanimous consent to have the statement published in the body of the Record, as a part of my remarks; and I hereby associate myself with the com-

ment and arguments which Mr. Smith makes in the course of his statement.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I shall not object—I wish the distinguished Senator from Oregon to know that neither North Dakota nor South Dakota has gotten a single defense contract.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want my good friend the Senator from North Dakota, to know that he has, here and now, my support for ending the discrimination on the part of this administration in respect to its policies both in relation to the Pacific Northwest and to the States of North Dakota and South Dakota, as well.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield—

Mr. MORSE. I do not have the floor.

Mr. CASE. In any event, Mr. President, I should like to correct the record by saying that South Dakota does have some such contracts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has requested unanimous consent for the printing of the statement in the body of the RECORD. Is there objection? Without objection—

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that I heard my distinguished friend, the Senator from Oregon, use the blanket term "Pacific Northwest." I must say that the State of Washington has many war contracts of great magnitude; but I want to associate myself with the Senator's statement in regard to what we call smaller business in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. MORSE. I was merely trying to save the feelings of my good friend from Washington. What I might have said was, there has been some discrimination on the part of this administration in favor of the State of Washington over the State of Oregon. But we will let it go on the basis of how the record stands, with this serious comment—because everyone present knows I have been speaking jocularly in reply to the Senator from Washington. Seriously, the Senator from Washington is correct in stressing the point that the small business of the Pacific Northwest certainly have been subjected to most unfair discrimination by the authorities in charge of the defense program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF EDGAR W. SMITH, PRESIDENT, PORTLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, BEFORE THE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PORTLAND, OREG., JULY 5, 1951

As president of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, I take this opportunity of welcoming you to our community. We appreciate the reasons behind your visit and hope that your stay here will be profitable to the committee and to the small-business men of this area.

As you have ascertained from your previous hearings, the problems of the small-

business men are many and are increasing day by day. Anything that your group might do to alleviate this situation will work to the good of the country as a whole.

From the standpoint of defense contracts, as you well know, there are two systems of bidding in force by the armed services; competitive bidding and negotiated bidding. In the competitive bidding situation we find that our manufacturers on the Pacific coast are at a disadvantage from the standpoint of the time element. When the Department of Commerce initiated its system of bid synopses sheets, many of our local companies that requested drawings and specifications found that they arrived the day the bids opened or after the bids were opened, even though in many cases telegrams had been sent to get the information. This situation has improved somewhat, and we find the Air Force is now mailing its bid specifications to this area and other branches of the service are trying to correct the situation, but we still feel that not enough time is allowed for our manufacturers to get the bids to the procurement offices most of which, as you all know, are located east of the Mississippi River. Some of our individual witnesses here will elaborate on the problems of this situation.

Another disadvantage on these competitive bids is that some of the specifications which apply were written from the standpoint of eastern suppliers. For instance, until recently, under General Services Administration specifications for furniture, no furniture containing alder or spruce core stock was acceptable. These two woods are used in all commercial lines of furniture produced in this area. Through the efforts of our Oregon delegation, on one recent order we were able to get these original specifications amended so that our people could bid, and two of our local concerns were able to get a part of this business. As a result of our demand for equal opportunity on this type of thing, the General Services Administration is sending a man out there to make a detailed check of our furniture industry with the view of rewriting many of the Government specifications that apply on these products.

Another matter which has militated against us on competitive bidding projects is that our cost of doing business is higher out here. We pay our workers a high level of wages. Steel and other products which have to be shipped to the area cost us more. Consequently, on many products in the metalworking line, our bids are higher than older eastern centers. In the wood products line our workers also receive twice as much pay as certain competitive areas in the South, and this has not helped the situation.

It is our belief that some of this Government purchasing should be regionalized and those items which are to be delivered in this area should be purchased in this region, if at all possible. For instance, on a recent bid specification on pallet boards for GSA, warehouses, 15,000 of these were to be delivered in Seattle and San Francisco, but the original specification called for oak pallet boards and all our local warehouses use pallets produced from Douglas fir grown and cut in this area. On this particular bid, several of our pallet manufacturers put in bids for Douglas fir pallets, but due to our high labor costs the lowest Northwest producer was about 50 cents a pallet higher than Southern producers.

When we come to the consideration of negotiated bids with the armed services, we find that we are also at a disadvantage. If you apply the Federal definition of small business as being "a concern that employs less than 500 persons and is not a dominant factor in its industry" you will find that almost 99 percent of our companies in the area fall in that category. There are only about

two score plants in the whole State of Oregon that employ more than 500 persons.

On the negotiated contracts we have found that preference is given to the large manufacturer, and perhaps from the viewpoint of the armed services there may be some justification in this preference. Many of these prime contractors, however, do not make a sincere effort in trying to spread the work to the smaller manufacturers. Also, on the negotiated bids, those organizations which have participated in the M-day mobilization program are given prior preference. It would seem to me that an honest effort should be made to spread around the work.

We have been able to bring in many subcontracts to this area by reason of the fact that we have camped on the doorstep of the prime contractors on the Pacific Coast, and have prepared a detailed brochure giving the machine tool facilities of all the metal-working plants in the Portland area. In this way we are able to convince these prime contractors that we do have small concerns in the area which can do a job for them. It is a hard proposition, however, and by and large most of the companies in this area with the machinery that will work to close tolerances are pretty busy at the present time. Nevertheless our economy out here has been built on a job-shop basis and very few of our plants have been geared up to quantity production. It is these smaller job-shop plants that are feeling the effect of the mobilization program, particularly as they will be faced with greater and greater shortages of materials such as steel, copper, aluminum and other items.

Another anomalous situation has developed recently. Several of our companies have been able to get contracts from the armed services only to find that their DO priority ratings will not get them steel and other materials which will enable them to make delivery in the time requested by the contracting services. On the other hand, large manufacturers appear to be in a generally more favorable position with respect to materials; first, because they are larger and therefore preferred customers of basic suppliers, and second, because they have greater financial resources to seek out and buy materials perhaps at higher prices than a smaller concern can afford to pay. In this respect it is realized that the proposed controlled materials plan is supposed to eliminate such difficulties of supplies to concerns that have actual defense contracts; however, the smaller manufacturer who has had a rough time in the past wants to be shown that such is the case.

Our electrical appliance wholesalers and dealers, and our automobile dealers are having tough times due to the credit regulations which have been imposed by the Federal Reserve system. Also, our building contractors are beginning to feel the pinch. We realize that the basic concept of these credit regulations is to cut down the consumption of critical materials and channel it to the defense needs; but if the employees of such concerns in our area lose their jobs and have to go to other areas where there is more defense business, then these controls work a permanent hardship on our region. These difficulties will be explained in more detail by the witnesses that are here today representing these segments of our economy.

The problems arising out of the Office of Price Stabilization are many and varied. We all know the need of price control, but the multitude of work necessary for the concerns to fill out forms, etc., means the hiring of extra help—the cost of which cannot be absorbed as easily by small concerns as by large concerns. It is my firm conviction that the biggest enemy of our country at the present time is inflation. The Federal Government, in its quest to get maximum production of military requirements, as well as to maintain

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JULY 12, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1951, to June 30, 1951, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Walter L. Reynolds, chief clerk.....	\$10,846.00	\$5,422.98
Ann M. Grickis, assistant chief clerk.....	6,066.23	3,033.06
Mollie Jo Hughes (Mrs.) (Jan. 1 to Apr. 15), clerical assistant.....	4,328.19	1,262.38
Emily I. Tennyson (Mrs.), clerical assistant.....	4,415.10	2,207.52
Velda Blanche Holder, clerical assistant.....	4,415.10	2,207.52
Ray Barnett, clerical assistant.....	4,154.38	2,001.11
Katharine M. Ellis (Mrs.) (from Apr. 16), clerical assistant.....	4,328.19	901.70
Glenn K. Shriver, professional staff member.....	9,766.16	4,883.04
Miles Senn, Jr., professional staff member.....	10,015.02	5,007.48
Herman C. Loeffler, professional staff member.....	10,846.00	5,422.98
Thomas A. Sappington (Jan. 1 to Feb. 15), professional staff member.....	9,434.35	1,179.28
Eli B. Nobleman (from Feb. 16), professional staff member.....	9,434.35	3,537.85

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 82d Cong..... \$10,000.00
Amount expended..... 601.25

Balance unexpended..... 9,398.75

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON RELATIONS WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (S. RES. 205)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1951, to February 15, 1951, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Eli B. Nobleman, counsel.....	\$9,019.59	\$1,127.44
Katharine M. Ellis (Mrs.), secretary.....	4,328.19	541.02

Total funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditure under S. Res. 205, 81st Congress..... \$18,000.00
Total amount expended under S. Res. 205, 81st Congress..... 13,802.37

Balance unexpended..... 4,197.63

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
Chairman, Subcommittee.

JULY 12, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION (S. RES. 54)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from February 1, 1951, to June 30, 1951, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Katharine M. Ellis (Mrs.) (Feb. 16 to Apr. 15), secretary.....	\$4,328.19	\$721.36
Paul H. Menk, Jr. (Mar. 1 to 15), staff member.....	9,632.07	413.83
Dr. George B. Galloway (Library of Congress reimbursed for salary) (Feb. 1 to June 30), consultant.....	10,846.00	4,495.16

Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditure under S. Res. 54, 82d Cong..... \$19,000.00
Amount expended..... 5,791.16

Balance unexpended..... 13,208.84

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
Chairman, Subcommittee.

JULY 12, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS (S. RES. 205)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1951, to February 15, 1951, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Paul H. Menk, Jr., staff member.....	\$9,932.07	\$1,655.33
Juanita E. Terry (Jan. 3 to 15), clerical assistant.....	3,806.78	137.46
Janet I. Valdes (Mrs.) (Jan. 16 to Feb. 15), clerical assistant.....	3,806.78	817.22
Dr. George B. Galloway (Library of Congress, reimbursed for salary) (Jan. 1 to 31), consultant.....	10,750.00	895.83

Total funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditure under S. Res. 205, 81st Cong..... \$15,000.00
Total amount expended..... 14,949.55

Balance unexpended..... 50.45

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1951.

REPORT OF SENATE INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (S. RES. 51)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1951, to June 30, 1951, together with the

funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Alderman, Jerome S., assistant counsel.....	\$8,521.88	\$4,260.90
Anderson, Edith H., assistant clerk (from Jan. 16).....	4,067.49	1,864.22
Bellino, Carmine S., accountant-investigator (from Mar. 1).....	10,846.00	3,615.32
Eastin, Mary B., assistant clerk (from Apr. 11 to May 5).....	3,980.59	276.42
Flanagan, Francis D., chief counsel.....	10,846.00	5,422.98
Hatcher, Howell J., chief assistant counsel.....	10,844.54	5,422.26
Kenny, Lucille O., assistant clerk.....	3,846.08	1,780.26
Lee, Lydia, record clerk (to Feb. 28).....	5,631.72	638.62
Leece, William A., assistant counsel (from Mar. 14).....	7,277.60	2,163.04
McCabill, Myles O., investigator (to Mar. 18).....	6,326.94	1,370.82
McElroy, Robert J., investigator.....	5,110.31	2,439.26
Montier, Gladys E., assistant clerk.....	5,588.89	2,294.40
Myers, Mariba Rose, assistant clerk (from Apr. 5).....	3,546.08	847.10
Sheridan, James F., investigator.....	6,674.55	3,337.26
Thomas, James H., assistant counsel.....	5,718.63	2,849.30
Young, Ruth M., clerk.....	4,588.89	2,294.40
Bellino, Carmine S., accountant-investigator (to Feb. 28).....	130.12	1,506.37

1 Per diem.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure..... \$102,821.47
Amount expended..... 51,731.50

Balance unexpended..... 51,089.97

CLYDE R. HOEY,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1846. A bill for the relief of Misako Watanabe and her daughter, Irene Terumi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1847. A bill for expenditure of funds for cooperating with the public-school board at Sisseton, S. Dak., for the extension of public-school facilities to be available to all Indian children in the district; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FREAR (by request):

S. 1848. A bill to provide, in the event of hostile or warlike action against the United States, for the restoration and rehabilitation of community facilities and services, and industrial facilities; for aid to civilians in distress; for the payment of indemnities for damage to or loss of property; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

INCREASED COMPENSATION AND PENSION FOR VETERANS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 4394) to provide certain increases in the monthly rates of compensation and pension payable to veterans and their dependents, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point in my remarks, a very short explanatory statement which I have prepared, concerning the amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance; and, without objection, the explanatory statement presented by the Senator from

New York will be printed in the RECORD. The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

The simple purpose of the amendments is to place veterans of the Spanish American War on equal footing with men who served in either the First or Second World War.

H. R. 4394 grants approximately a 5-percent increase in pensions to veterans of World Wars I and II and their dependents. Through some oversight veterans of the Spanish American War were not included in the bill. The amendments would rectify that oversight.

Surely no one intends to favor the veterans of one war over those of another. In all wars men risk their lives and property for their country and its ideals. In partial recognition of this fact the Government grants pensions to those who fought. Some adjustment in pensions has been made necessary by the recent rise in price levels. These price level rises certainly have affected veterans and dependents of veterans of the Spanish American War as much as any other group.

Therefore equity demands that Spanish American War veterans be included in this bill.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. MOODY:

Article entitled "DiSalle Replies to Post Series on OPS Rulings," written by Michael V. DiSalle, Director of Price Stabilization, and published in the Washington Post of July 9, 1951, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

Resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the Nebraska Small-Business Men's Association on June 15, 1951, regarding the interference of Government in private business.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article entitled "Salvaging the Medical Care of Veterans," written by Arthur Krock, and published in New York Times of July 12, 1951.

A RULE OF RELEVANCY IN SENATE DEBATE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on June 21, 1951, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] submitted Senate Resolution 158, amending Rule 10 of the Standing Rules of the Senate. The amendment would merely add the words "A Senator, upon being recognized, shall confine himself to the question under debate."

The problem to which this amendment is vitally important. Reasons for its early consideration are cogently set forth in an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on July 10, 1951, and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be inserted on the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CROOKED STICK

Why is Congress so pathetically behind in its work? To catalog all the answers would require a long piece, but some of the most glaring reasons are being emphasized by the legislators themselves. Not long ago Senator HENDRICKSON chided his colleagues for their appalling waste of time through irrelevant debate. "I am not half so concerned about the semiannual filibuster," he said, "as I

am about the almost daily flights into irrelevancy which carry us far afield from the superabundant work we have to do. * * * The inefficiency of this body simply does not comport with the traditional efficiency that so typifies America. * * * We move, all right, but in so many different directions that forward progress is often indiscernible."

Senator HENDRICKSON introduced a resolution designed, as he said, to "put a stop to 80 years of rambling." It would simply require a Senator enjoying the privilege of the floor to confine himself to the question under debate. If approved and enforced, it would bring about a revolution in the Senate. Every year it would save weeks of valuable time and greatly enhance the prestige of the Senate in the minds of the people.

Despite the heavy pressure on the present Congress, an enormous amount of time has also gone into the enactment of private bills. The daily digest of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 2 shows that Congress has enacted in its present session (up to June 30) 132 private bills and only 70 public bills. In 1946 Congress was so concerned about frittering away its time on trivialities that it forbade the introduction of certain types of private bills. This reform has undoubtedly paid dividends, but the flow of private bills is still enormous. Chairman CELLER of the House Judiciary Committee recently told the Senate Committee on Expenditures that a total of 1,514 private claims, immigration and naturalization bills had been submitted to his committee in 5½ months. Public bills and resolutions going to the same committee totaled less than one third that figure.

Some of these private bills are important. To ignore them completely would give rise to grave injustices. Yet the Congress which must shape national and international policies and authorize the spending of \$70,000,000,000 or more cannot give much time to private law-making without grossly neglecting its principal function. Some reformers believe that all claims against the Government and all special exemptions from the letter of the immigration and naturalization laws should be handled by administrative agencies. Representative CELLER has suggested a joint congressional committee, with an adequate staff of experts, to pass upon all sorts of private bills.

Whichever is preferred, it seems to us imperative that some means be adopted to conserve the time of Congress for its major tasks of policy-making. Instead of trying to plow more furiously with its crooked stick, it is about time for Congress to adapt its machinery and methods to the enormous tasks before it.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$4,600,000, of which not to exceed \$3,163,396 shall be available for personal services, and."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], who is detained, I ask that that amendment go over, and that it be considered immediately after the Senate has considered the next committee amendment which will be taken up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be tempo-

rarily passed over. The clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, line 4, after the word "which", it is proposed to strike out "\$3,500,000" and insert "\$3,903,500."

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask that that amendment also be passed over temporarily.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona has asked that the committee amendment just stated be temporarily passed over. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	McKellar
Anderson	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bennett	Hennings	Monroney
Bricker	Hill	Moody
Bridges	Hoeey	Morse
Butler, Md.	Holland	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Neely
Byrd	Hunt	Nixon
Cain	Ives	O'Connor
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kem	Russell
Clements	Kerr	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Langer	Stennis
Duff	Lehman	Taft
Dworshak	Lodge	Thye
Eastland	Long	Underwood
Ecton	Magnuson	Watkins
Ellender	Malone	Welker
Ferguson	Maybank	Wherry
Frear	McCarthy	Williams
Fulbright	McClellan	Young
George	McFarland	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent on official committee business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave

of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, line 21, it is proposed to strike out the numeral "\$197,000,000" and insert "\$208,344,450, of which not to exceed \$29,160,408 shall be available for personal services, and."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The secretary will state the amendment heretofore proposed by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] as a substitute for the committee amendment, as amended.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, line 21, in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert the following: "\$220,561,450, of which not to exceed \$29,160,408 shall be available for personal services and."

On page 18, line 23, in lieu of the figure "\$28,972,650" it is proposed to insert "\$33,896,650."

The VICE PRESIDENT. That amendment was offered on the 5th of July.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment to the committee amendment is to increase the amount allowed by the Committee on Appropriations for new projects, eight in number, and to include an item relating to the operation and maintenance of the All-American Canal, amounting to \$191,000, in accordance with the agreement with the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Do I understand that the Senator is tying the two items together? Since the All-American Canal item does not call for an increase, and inasmuch as a similar amount is being deducted from another portion of the bill, I believe it would be better to get an agreement that the \$191,000 item be not tied in with the increase, which is an entirely different situation.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from California and I discussed the matter. I should like to inquire of the Chair whether the amendment offered by the Senator from California, increasing the amount in the bill by \$191,000, was adopted by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recalls that the Senator from Arizona asked unanimous consent that the Senator from California be permitted to offer such an amendment. It was offered and agreed to. The amendment was at page 18, line 21.

Mr. HAYDEN. If that is the case, the matter has already been attended to.

Then, Mr. President, I modify my substitute amendment to the committee amendment as amended by reducing it by \$191,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's substitute amendment to the committee amendment as amended will be modified accordingly.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; by reducing the amount by \$191,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have an amendment to reduce the item of \$208,344,450 in the committee amendment to \$198,000,000. Will the amendment of the Senator from Arizona to the committee amendment as amended, if either adopted or rejected, bar the offering of my amendment to the committee amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the amendment of the Senator from Arizona were defeated, it would not bar the offering of the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment as amended; but if it were agreed to, the amendment of the Senator from Michigan might be barred. In other words, if the substitute amendment of the Senator from Arizona to the committee amendment as amended is agreed to, no amendment to it would then be in order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Of course, Mr. President, that will be the case if the substitute which I am offering is agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that. As I understand, the substitute would add eight other items which should not necessarily prevent an attempt to reduce the amount of an item which is already in the bill. That is my point.

Mr. HAYDEN. First we shall vote on the question of increasing the amount. If that attempt is defeated, then a motion to reduce the amount would be in order.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Arizona wishes to add a certain amount in order to cover eight new projects, my question is whether the substitute amendment of the Senator from Arizona, if adopted, would prevent the offering of an amendment to reduce the amount already carried in the committee amendment for another project.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the amendment of the Senator from Arizona to the committee amendment as amended is agreed to, thus placing in the bill an amount relating to eight other projects, or even if no new projects were affected, that would end the matter; no further amendments to that committee amendment would be in order.

Mr. FERGUSON. But if the amendment of the Senator from Arizona to the committee amendment as amended is rejected, then the committee amendment as amended will still be open to amendment, by way of a reduction or an increase in the amount. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the amendment of the Senator from Arizona to the committee amendment as amended is rejected, the committee amendment as amended will revert to its present status quo and will be open to further amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. With further reference to the amendment on page 18, which I understand has been amended to take care of the All-American Canal amount of \$191,000, along with that, and simultaneous with it, could we obtain unanimous consent to reduce the amount in the other section?

Mr. HAYDEN. That was done.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It was done?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wanted to be sure that the increase occurred in one place and a reduction occurred in the other.

Mr. HAYDEN. Inasmuch as all the figures will have to go to conference, I do not think it is especially important one way or another at this time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; except the amount will have to come out of the operation and maintenance fund and the Colorado River Dam construction fund.

Mr. HAYDEN. The point is that if the matter is covered by our action here, when the bill is taken to conference, once the conference report is prepared there will be no question about it.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I wish to inquire whether the Senator's modified substitute amendment to the committee amendment as amended includes the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, in Washington.

Mr. HAYDEN. I was about to state what the projects are: The Solano project, in California, \$2,500,000. That project will be largely paid for. The greater part of the repayment will be made by the city of Vallejo and other cities adjacent to the Mare Island Navy Yard, which now are in desperate need for water. They have contracts for their water supply; and if there were no prospect of obtaining water from this source, which is a reservoir on a tributary of the Sacramento River, conveying it down through the irrigable lands and then to the cities where the bulk of the water will be used, the project would never be undertaken, because the cities would be compelled to go directly to the Sacramento River to get their water supply; and once they obtained it, this project would no longer be feasible.

The next project is the Palisades project, in Idaho, \$2,500,000. The Federal Government has already expended \$3,000,000 on that project. The town site has been leveled, and buildings are there, ready for the construction. A highway is necessary in order to reach the dam site. This project is primarily a power project. The need for the power has been certified by the Defense Electrical Administration, which has certified that the power will be needed in the area because of the great atomic development and other developments in that area. Once the defense emergency is over, this project will be very valuable for water-supply purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not regard the Palisades project as entirely a new one. It is partly for supplemental water, and it is rounding out an irrigation project. Certainly it should be completed. I think money will be lost if we do not complete it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not think there can be any doubt about that.

Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Senator from Idaho wishes to ask a question at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest to the Senator from Arizona that we are operating under a 15-minute limitation, and the Senator's time is about to expire.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as late as December of last year Defense Mobilization Director Wilson said:

There is today enough power to meet the present needs, with a safe reserve margin. There will continue to be enough power to meet anticipated needs if the equipment now on order and planned by the electrical industry is built and installed as scheduled, despite a shift to a partial war economy.

So the power is there. Equipment is needed; but the availability of the equipment will depend in part upon the availability of materials.

Therefore, I cannot see any persuasive case for adding new projects, notwithstanding the fact that emphasis will be placed upon irrigation purposes when the power needs diminish as a result of whatever may happen in the war picture.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, let me state to the Senator from Illinois that there is a special certification with respect to this project, and I hope the Senator from Idaho will place the certification in the RECORD.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 1 minute?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I should like to inform the distinguished Senator from Illinois, my able friend, of the fact that there is definitely an acute power shortage at the atomic-energy installation at Arco, Idaho, and that was the reason why the Defense Electrical Administration certified this project as being a much-needed one.

For the Senator's information, let me say further that the city of Idaho Falls, which is closely related in distance to the Palisades project, is now spending \$150,000 a year to an out-of-State concern to obtain electrical energy for the lights of the city, which has almost nine-tenths of the new inhabitants who have been brought into the State of Idaho by virtue of the giant atomic-energy project at Arco, Idaho.

Briefly to show the shortage of electrical energy in the State of Idaho at this very moment, let me say that just a few weeks ago the Monsanto Chemical Co. was interested in opening a plant in the State of Idaho to develop some very technical chemical processes. Before the Monsanto company would make that move into Idaho it was necessary for us to negotiate a contract with the Utah

Power Co., an out-of-State corporation, so that it could channel and wheel power into the southern portion of the State of Idaho, only a few miles from the Palisades project.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, let me inquire how much time remains to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Only 2 minutes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then let me state briefly that the next item is for \$1,174,000 for the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, in Washington, which is not a new project, but is merely a unit of an existing project.

Then there is the Riverton project, in Wyoming, calling for \$250,000 to build a canal in connection with an existing project, in order to irrigate about 30,000 acres of land.

In the Missouri River Basin, the lower Marias unit in Montana is a project for which Congress appropriated money last year with which to begin construction. The money was impounded by the Bureau of the Budget. The same is true of the Jamestown unit in North Dakota, where a city has been flooded.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute to me to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a statement I had intended to make on the Jamestown unit. I should like to say that that unit, under the Pick-Sloan plan, was originally an Army engineers' project, which was transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation 2 years ago. I feel that it is in exactly the same category with Army engineer projects, and that, if we eliminate the appropriation to start this project, then we should also do the same in regard to all so-called new-start projects under the Army engineers.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR YOUNG

The No. 1 water development project which the State water conservation commission and the Governor of my State are desirous should next be placed under early construction is the dam and reservoir unit at Jamestown, N. Dak. North Dakota's last legislative assembly passed a resolution strongly urging and requesting Congress to make funds available for the early construction of this project.

Personally, I deem it of the utmost importance that construction be started on this unit of the Missouri-Souris division of the great Missouri River Basin plan. It is for this reason that I am speaking in behalf of the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] which will provide funds for starting construction on the Jamestown Dam and the other projects listed.

This dam would be located about a mile and one-half upstream from the city of Jamestown on the James River, an eastern tributary of the Missouri River. The James River rises in east central North Dakota, flows in a southerly direction a distance of 710 miles, and enters the Missouri River near Yankton, S. Dak.

During the last 8 years the James River Basin has suffered four serious floods, two of which occurred last year. The damage from the flooding in the Jamestown area in 1950 was estimated by the State engineer at \$2,345,000. This amount is almost one-half of the estimated cost of the dam proper.

Although the project would serve as flood protection works for both urban and rural areas, it would also provide storage for irrigation water and help regulate stream flow for municipal and domestic water supply and navigation.

The Jamestown Dam and Reservoir has already been authorized for construction by the Congress.

Although no power plant facilities will be constructed at the Jamestown Dam, its construction will permit a reduction of 12,000 acre-feet in the diversion from the Missouri River for irrigation purposes. This means that the 12,000 acre-feet would continue, as it does now, to flow down the Missouri River through the main stem dams to generate power. This water savings feature will also permit smaller pumping plants to be provided for the irrigation diversions and smaller canals later to be used when the irrigation works are developed.

This dam and reservoir are needed now to corral the unruly James River and to serve as an integral part of the ultimate and likewise already authorized irrigation project which is to come along there within a few years.

A few years ago, I think it was in the fiscal year 1943, when the Missouri itself had a major flood, the Congress authorized the Bureau of Reclamation to start construction of 13 tributary dams which were multiple-purpose in character, just like the Jamestown Dam, with the understanding that they would serve for flood-control purposes initially and would later serve the irrigation purposes when irrigation works are developed. The 13 dams which the Congress has already provided for on this basis are: Boysen and Keyhole Dams in Wyoming; Moorhead Dam in Montana; Shadehill and Bixby Dams in South Dakota; Cannonball, Heart Butte, and Dickinson Dams in North Dakota; Bonny Dam and Narrows Dam in Colorado; Trenton and Enders Dams in Nebraska; and Cedar Bluff Dam in Kansas.

Many of those dams are now either completed or are nearing completion, but none of them protects any James River area.

In the appropriation for fiscal year 1951, \$750,000 was provided by Congress for this worthy project to start construction work at the earliest possible date. These funds were later impounded by the Bureau of the Budget under section 1214 of the appropriation act.

We want to proceed with the Jamestown Dam on a similar basis. There is precedent for this; there is need for it; the project is already authorized by the Congress; funds have previously been appropriated for it; and I hope that the Senate will adopt the pending amendment which includes the Jamestown Dam along with the other important new starts mentioned therein.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I wonder whether Senators opposing the amendment could use some of their time. They have not used any of it as yet. Will they be so courteous as to use some of their time?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. HAYDEN. Perhaps the Senator from Kansas can obtain time from the Senator from Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair cannot recognize any Senators except Senators to whom time is yielded by those in control of the time.

Mr. FERGUSON. How much time does the Senator from Kansas desire?

Mr. CARLSON. I should appreciate it if the Senator from Michigan will yield me 2 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield the Senator 2 minutes.

Mr. CARLSON. In view of the fact that the section with which we are now dealing has to do with the reclamation projects of the great West, I want to deal especially with the Missouri River Basin. There are projects in this bill which are listed in both class A and class B.

It so happens that Kansas, at this time, is suffering from one of the most serious and disastrous floods in its history. In fact, we in Kansas have been talking about the flood of 1903 as the daddy or father of all floods. I have just received a report from Topeka, Kans., which states that the flood at Topeka at the present time is 1 foot above the dike level and approaching the 1903 level. That refers to the dikes which have been built by the Army engineers. There are 19,000 people in Topeka who are homeless. Two large river river bridges went out this morning. There is no railroad transportation either in Topeka or throughout the entire State.

I would urge the Bureau of Reclamation, which has the projects on the tributary streams of the Kansas River, to revalue or restudy, if I may so suggest, the flood-control benefits of the reservoirs in these streams. I think it most important to future flood control and to the control of water run-off in my State.

I appreciate the fact that this is the time to come in with amendments, but I believe we should first have the study. I have discussed this matter with the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Arizona. It is hoped that the Bureau of Reclamation, in cooperation with the Corps of Army Engineers, will make a restudy of these reservoirs and will, as in my opinion they should, allocate greater benefits to flood control in these reservoirs.

Mr. CAIN and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan, who is substituting for the Senator from Nebraska, yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oregon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to support the observations made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] in regard to the need of more money for the purpose of relieving the great shortage of power which exists, not only in Idaho, but in the entire Pacific Northwest. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD an argument which I submitted to the Appropriations Committee this

morning in support of the position taken yesterday by my colleagues in the Senate from Washington and Idaho, and by my senior colleague from Oregon. In my statement before the committee I urged a restoration of the complete budget estimates for McNary, Albeni Falls, the Dalles, and Ice Harbor Dams.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I very much appreciate the opportunity to express my support of the Pacific Northwest power-supply program, which you are now considering. I heartily endorse the views of my colleagues from the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho and of the representatives of public and private power agencies regarding the need of the McNary, Chief Joseph, Albeni Falls, the Dalles, and Ice Harbor Dams.

I do not wish to be critical of the members of the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee, but I do not believe that they were properly informed as to the drastic impact of the reduction in funds that they recommended. Chief Joseph Dam, McNary Dam, and Albeni Falls Dam are under construction. I mention Chief Joseph at this point only to emphasize its need, since the requested funds for that project were allowed.

Of equal or greater importance at this time are the Albeni Falls and McNary projects. Albeni Falls is important because the water stored in its reservoir will firm up a large block of power at downstream plants and because, being a comparatively small project, it can be completed rapidly. This project was last year considered of sufficient importance that supplemental funds were provided to begin its construction. Two million nine hundred thousand dollars were appropriated in fiscal year 1951 for this purpose. The Corps of Engineers have requested an additional \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1952 which will permit construction to proceed at a rate so that the storage at Albeni Falls will be available before the winter period of 1952-53, which period will be one of the most critical that we have experienced. Albeni Falls water will provide an additional 110,000 kilowatts at existing plants and this power will be available during a period when 596,000 kilowatts of the regional power load is being supplied on an interruptible basis, with the firm power from Albeni Falls included. If Albeni Falls is not permitted to go ahead on schedule the firm power deficit becomes 706,000 kilowatts in 1952-53.

Funds for McNary Dam were reduced by \$6,900,000 by the House of Representatives. This means a year's delay in completion of the project at a time when the region cannot stand such a delay. McNary Dam will be the first large power producer to come into operation in the near future. It is presently scheduled for completion in December 1953, with additional generators planned for installation at a rate of four a year until a total of 14 generators are installed.

On the basis of present schedules of construction the region faces a firm power deficit of 600,000 kilowatts in 1951-52, 596,000 kilowatts in 1952-53, 447,000 kilowatts in 1953-54, 281,000 kilowatts in 1954-55. If the reductions are permitted to stand, these figures become 600,000 kilowatts in 1951-52, 706,000 kilowatts in 1952-53, 670,000 kilowatts in 1953-54, 733,000 kilowatts in 1954-55 and these figures do not include 90,000 kilowatts in 1952-53 and 120,000 kilowatts in 1953-54 for the production of aluminum in equipment already installed and which would be in operation if power were available. Equipment to produce this additional amount of aluminum is being installed for operation on a few-months-a-year basis because power will be

available to serve these loads only if better than median water conditions prevail.

Nor is the picture any better if you look beyond 1954-55. For this reason the President included in his budget a request for funds for two new starts, the Dalles and Ice Harbor. Both of these projects must be started immediately if we are to see any prospect of an end to the present power shortage. The Dalles Dam will have an installed capacity when complete of 980,000 kilowatts and, if started immediately, can begin operation in November 1956. It would be complete in November 1959 with four 70,000-kilowatt units being installed each year between these two dates. It is a most important plant in the program because of its location close to much of the major loads and because of its contribution to the power requirements of the area.

Ice Harbor dam is equally important. Its installed capacity will be 260,000 kilowatts and if started immediately can come into operation in December 1955 and be completed by August of 1956. This plant, in addition to its over-all contribution to the power requirements, is geographically located to improve the reliability of power service to the great Hanford project which must have an extremely reliable power supply.

Even including these two projects in the program as scheduled there will be in 1956-57 a firm power deficit of 748,000 kilowatts and in 1957-58, 924,000 kilowatts.

Gentlemen, these figures are startling. Their entire significance will probably not be completely understood until a minimum water year occurs in the Northwest region which will require the curtailment of power service in the amounts I have stated, resulting in impairment of the national defense effort, extreme hardship, unemployment, and generally drastic effects on the regional and national economy.

I should like to point out that the Pacific Northwest has not shirked its duty in the present national emergency. Every effort is being strained to provide for the needs of national defense. Forty percent of the present power supply goes into the production of aluminum. Power is also being made available for the production of magnesium, phosphorus, chlorine, and other important materials of a critical nature. The Northwest is ideally situated for the production of these materials and it has accepted the role assigned it in the national defense picture. In addition there are Army bases, Air Force bases and Navy shipyards and other important defense activities. If power curtailment becomes necessary, these defense activities will suffer along with all other activities of the region and this cannot be permitted.

Electric power is the motive force behind every activity in our Nation. It is even more so in the Pacific Northwest because in the distribution of natural resources Mother Nature chose to endow the Northwest with the greatest hydroelectric potential in the world in lieu of supplies of oil, gas, and coal. We have neither oil nor gas and only minor amounts of coal. Hydroelectric power, therefore, in our only energy base and it is of the utmost importance not only to the region itself but to the entire Nation, that the resources we have be exploited to the maximum degree and in the shortest time reasonably possible. Such exploitation has been planned for but the plan has not been permitted to proceed as scheduled because of lack of sufficient funds to permit such orderly procedure. Fortunately we have had adequate amounts of water in the past few years for the full utilization of the power equipment that was available, but to expect such water supplies to be available each year ad infinitum is frankly pushing our luck too far. We are going to have a minimum water year. We can only hope and

pray that it does not come during the next 2 years when there is little that we could do about it. We can do something about it in subsequent years, if we move immediately to bring new power producers into operation.

I should also like to emphasize the fact that the appropriations that are requested are of a completely different nature than those required for normal governmental operation. This point has been mentioned many times before but it cannot be said too many times that all moneys appropriated are merely a loan which will be repaid with interest. This is only a minor part. By supporting the regional economy in this way the general tax base of the region becomes doubled and trebled so that the returns to the Nation are many times the amounts expended for the construction of these power projects. If the money were never returned it still would be a most lucrative investment for the Nation. However, it is returned and it is returned with interest.

Certainly it must be realized that the country is saving nothing by cutting off the few millions required for these power projects. It saves nothing but actually will represent a great loss. I should point out that by delaying McNary 1 year the revenue loss over the 1954-55 period would be approximately \$5,500,000 which is nearly equal to the reduction of \$6,900,000 that has been made in the funds for this project. That, gentlemen, is not economy.

The Federal Government has a definite public utility responsibility in the Pacific Northwest. At the present time it supplies more than half of the power consumed in the region. Having this responsibility the Government must live up to it. I should also like to emphasize the fact which has been so ably presented to you by others that the non-Federal utilities have not been backward about spending their money to enhance the power-resource picture of the region. At the present time they have active plans to add a million kilowatts to the regional supply and stand ready to add another one-half million as soon as proper clearances can be obtained. The local people are doing all that they can to help themselves. The Federal Government must therefore do its part to match the effort of the region itself.

I honestly urge you gentlemen to restore the complete budget estimates for McNary, Albeni Falls, The Dalles and Ice Harbor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I close by pointing out that the unanimous-consent agreement under which we are now operating in the Senate on a bill containing items which are of vital importance not only to the affected areas, but to the security of the country, is another example showing why a unanimous-consent agreement like the one under which we are now operating ought never to be entered into in the Senate. It would not have been entered into yesterday if the junior Senator from Oregon had not been called off the floor temporarily on a matter of official business at the time the unanimous-consent request was made. I suggest that it was and is well known what the junior Senator from Oregon would have done had he been present: he would have objected to the agreement.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I offer for printing in the body of the Record a statement in support of the amendment

offered by the Senator from Arizona, and I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of my remarks at this point in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator from Michigan very much.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN

I wish to speak in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

One of the projects included in this amendment is in Washington State. It is the Kennewick division of the Yakima irrigation project. Four other divisions of this project, started 40 years ago, are already completed or rapidly nearing completion.

The Kennewick division is a combined irrigation and power project. It was authorized in the Eightieth Congress. Both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees last year determined that it was not a new project but a part of the construction of the very successful Yakima project.

This project is designed to irrigate 21,000 acres of lands, 16,700 acres of which are underdeveloped range lands, and 4,300 acres of lands presently irrigated by pumping. It will also provide 12,000 kilowatts of electric energy to a power-hungry community. Sale of this power output will help pay the construction costs of the entire project.

In the land assembly necessary for the atomic energy plant at Hanford which is immediately adjacent to Kennewick, some 7,000 acres of irrigated lands were taken out of production. With the establishment of the Hanford Engineering Works, 50,000 people were attracted to and added to this area. The new land to be brought under irrigation and into production by this project is greatly needed to bring the agricultural economy of the area back into balance.

Irrigation and power projects of this type are prime investments for they return dollar for dollar their cost to the Federal Government and indirectly provide additional revenue through expanded income-tax payments.

I compliment the chairman for the wisdom of his amendment and I encourage its approval.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator, because I desire to say a word in support of the amendment. I should first like to say to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into after a quorum call was had on the Senate floor, and his rights were absolutely protected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I have not the time to yield at this time.

Mr. MORSE. I figured the Senator would like to have a reply.

Mr. WHERRY. I may answer the junior Senator from Oregon, who apparently feels that he was deprived of his rights, that the unanimous-consent agreement was not entered into until after a quorum call was had.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will consult the Official Reporter and ascertain what I said, he cannot make the interpretation of my remarks that I was intimating that my rights had been violated; but the Senator knows what

I would have done if I had been present. The fact is that I was not notified in advance by either the majority or minority leader that they intended to offer such an agreement. Both of them should have known that I would object to such an agreement if such notice had been given me. My parliamentary rights were not violated because a quorum call was ordered, but it was ordered and the agreement offered when I was not available to object because of official business elsewhere.

Now several of my colleagues see how right I am on this issue and have just told me that they see that they made a mistake by not objecting.

Mr. WHERRY. One of the reasons why I support the amendment is that for 8½ years I have told the people of Nebraska that I would be in favor of this project. I have given my undivided support to the project, and I am going to keep faith with the people in Nebraska.

Another reason why I am making this statement is that I have just consulted the official journal of the Bureau of Reclamation, and I have received an expert analysis of what has been done in Rome, Italy. Year after year I have been in favor of cutting foreign economic aid appropriations, yet we learn from this journal of the Bureau of Reclamation that in Italy we are spending \$300,000,000 on reclamation projects, under the Marshall plan, none of which money is reimbursable. It is about time to start looking out for some of the reclamation projects in the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I regret that the Senate has only 30 minutes to discuss a matter which is so vital and so important to the Senate and to the people of the United States. After a committee of the Senate had turned down the projects, which were not taken up in the House at all, and the Senator from Michigan is informed from the record that they were not budgeted items, today we find the chairman of the subcommittee coming before the Senate and including in a lump sum eight different projects, in eight States, increasing the budget \$12,026,000.

Mr. President, if there ever was a case in which the Senate could be accused of logrolling and back scratching, it is this kind of a case. Think of it, a lump-sum appropriation, so that the Senate cannot vote upon each one of the projects. It is impossible to vote on any one of them as a single project, and then vote on the other projects. We find ourselves asked to take eight projects.

The Senator from Michigan knows how these matters got before the committee. They were, in fact, proposed by a former employee of a contracting firm. The proposal is designed for no other purpose than to back scratch and logroll, so that the projects can come before the Senate as a whole, and get \$12,026,000 in the appropriation now under consideration.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. WATKINS. For the benefit of the Senator from Michigan, let me say that the statement made by me to the committee, which is printed in the hearings, presented clearly the view of the people of Utah with respect to the Weber Basin project. There is no logrolling involved. It is an absolute necessity, from the standpoint of national defense, to take care of an area which has increased 113 percent in population by reason of defense installations. The junior Senator from Utah and I presented the matter in good faith, and there were no logrolling and back scratching, so far as we were concerned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two statements made to the Senate Appropriations Committee on this question.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF E. J. FJELDSTED, SECRETARY-MANAGER, WEBER BASIN WATER-CONSERVANCY DISTRICT, UTAH

AMOUNT REQUESTED FOR CONSTRUCTION

Mr. FJELDSTED. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee; my name is E. J. Fjeldsted. I am secretary-manager of the Weber Basin water-conservancy district. This water-conservancy district has been organized and is now prepared to contract with the Federal Government to repay the reimbursable costs of the proposed Weber Basin project.

I am here in my official capacity to urge this committee to approve funds in the amount of \$1,225,000 to initiate the construction of the first phase of this project in fiscal 1952.

I have prepared a statement. I should like to have it incorporated in the record in full. However, in the interest of time, I will make a summary statement.

(The document referred to is as follows:)

"A BRIEF OUTLINING THE IMPORTANCE OF IMMEDIATE DEVELOPMENT OF THE FIRST UNIT OF THE WEBER BASIN PROJECT IN THE INTEREST OF NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS AND DEFENSE

"The Weber Basin water conservancy district contends that there are no known sources of needed additional water in the Ogden area for domestic and industrial purposes except the surplus water produced by the watersheds of the Weber River Basin.

"CONCLUSIONS

"The limited supply of domestic water in Davis and Weber Counties points to serious health and restricted production standards if additional water is not immediately made available through development of the first unit of the Weber Basin project.

"Total governmental investments in military installations, plus the unexcelled transportation facilities in the area, make the immediate development of the first unit of the Weber Basin project a necessity.

"All communities in the area serving as the residence location for civilian employees at the military installations are faced with domestic water shortages of intense proportions in case of a drought year, which truly emphasizes the urgency of immediate construction of the first units of the Weber Basin project.

"DESCRIPTION OF WEBER RIVER BASIN

"The map on the following page illustrates the drainage area of the Weber River and shows by location the important facilities to be constructed under the direction of the Bureau of Reclamation for the final total development of all of the water resources of the Weber River.

"For this running description, Ogden City is named the revolving point.

"North of Ogden will be located the Willard Bay Reservoir which will have a capacity of 215,000 acre-feet of water. The water will flow into the reservoir by the Willard gravity canal and will flow back to the point of origin through the Willard pump canal, as indicated on the map.

"East of Ogden up the Ogden River, the main tributary of the Weber River, is the present Pine View Reservoir, a Bureau of Reclamation project, which in the total Weber Basin development will be enlarged to hold 110,000 acre-feet of water. Its present capacity is 45,000 acre-feet.

"Proceeding up the south fork of the same river, the proposed Maggie Reservoir site is planned to store 7,000 acre-feet.

"Starting again at Ogden at the center point, upstream on the Weber River along the Lost Creek tributary, the proposed Lost Creek Reservoir site is to store 20,000 acre-feet of water. Still proceeding along the main stream of the Weber River is found the Wanship site where it is proposed to store 60,000 acre-feet of water. This particular reservoir is a substitute for the original Perdue site and was accepted because the cost per acre-foot of storage water was much less and it also had several other engineering advantages.

"In the very high reaches of the Weber River there will be stored some 4,000 acre-feet in small reservoirs which undoubtedly will be built through local capital by water districts or otherwise.

"Going back to Morgan City and proceeding along East Canyon Creek past East Canyon Reservoir the Jeremy site is located. This site will store 45,000 acre-feet.

"At a point west of Morgan City will be noted Stoddard diversion dam, which will divert into the proposed aqueduct the total amount of the municipal, industrial, and irrigation water required by the municipalities and farm lands in Davis and Weber Counties. From the Stoddard diversion there will be an open, concrete-lined canal (indicated by the broken red line) to the tunnel section. A tunnel $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles long, extending through the mountain that forms the west wall of the Weber River opening through the Wasatch Range, will continue the conveyance of this water to the mouth of Weber Canyon.

"From the mouth of Weber Canyon the aqueduct will divide by bifurcation works, one leg proceeding north to the edge of Ogden City and the other south through Davis County to the Salt Lake County line. Concrete pipeline will be used the entire distance both ways. The function of this pipeline is outlined more clearly on page 3.

"LANDS TO BE IRRIGATED ON THE WASATCH FRONT IN DAVIS AND WEBER COUNTIES UNDER THE AQUEDUCT UNIT

"In the southern area there are 4,000 acres of new, nonirrigated land which can be developed. In the north end of the Davis County area there are 9,000 acres of new land, and in Weber County area 3,000 acres of new land. In the entire area from North Ogden City south to Bountiful City, there are an additional 10,000 acres of land requiring supplemental water.

"MUNICIPAL WATER SYSTEM AQUEDUCTS AND PIPELINES

"The aqueduct and the pipelines north and south carrying the water developed in the Weber Basin project are indicated in the following review of map No. 2.

"The blue line represents the proposed aqueduct system, and the red line shows where the water will be drawn from this system for municipal and industrial purposes. The irrigation water will be taken untreated from the aqueduct and delivered to the lands for use. This delivery will be made generally at the expense of the landowners who will

construct the major portion of their distribution system.

"The red squares on the map indicate location of the municipal water-treatment plants and the red lines indicate the transportation system for domestic water. All of the facilities represented by the red-line system of the map will be constructed and paid for by the participating municipalities throughout the area. The treatment system consists of four filtration and purification plants:

"The first plant, while not shown on the map, is located at the present Ogden municipal reservoir northeast of the main business section of Ogden City. Plant 2 is shown on the map and is to be located south of South Ogden City; plant 3 is to be in Davis County approximately three-quarters of a mile south of the highway that intersects U S 89 and proceeds to Hill Air Force Base; plant 4 will be in the Bountiful area to serve the southern part of Davis County.

"The mission of these plants is for pre-settlement through reservoirs, filtration, and chlorination. Through these plants and proper equalization reservoirs the water will be delivered to all of the municipalities in the area.

"As stated before, the entire cost of these treatment and distribution facilities, estimated between \$4,000,000 and \$6,000,000, will be financed locally, involving no Federal funds.

"PRESENT SOURCES AND LIMITS OF DOMESTIC AND INDUSTRIAL WATER ON THE WASATCH FRONT AND IN DAVIS AND WEBER COUNTIES

"The municipalities in Davis and Weber Counties have long since acquired and fully utilized all available sources of local mountain stream and spring supplies, and for a number of years have been drilling deep wells to supplement their mountain stream supplies during the peak use periods. The main source of municipal water in the Davis County area comes from the streams on the west face of the Wasatch Mountains. These streams have a wide annual variation of flow, as reflected in chart No. 3 which shows the total flow of the streams in Davis County.

"A review of this chart clearly indicates the serious condition these communities would face in case of a drought period. It is to be noted that the beds of the streams on the west face of the Wasatch Mountains are steep and the geological formation of the area is such that it is not economically feasible to construct storage reservoirs on these streams.

"In an explanation of chart No. 3, and the reference to deep wells, the question would arise, 'Why not continue the drilling of deep wells for the area's domestic water supply?' There are two restraining factors that make it impossible to rely on ground water for extended uses—one, the limited and restricted supply of domestic water of good quality and, two, the limited supply of recharge water.

"Weber and Davis Counties represent three somewhat restricted and independent ground-water basins. The first is the Weber County underground basin, the second one is the northern section of the Davis County, and the third would represent the underground-water section in the southern part of Davis County. A hot-water-springs fault extends the full length of the Wasatch front, in fact, much farther north than Weber County. The water which flows from this fault is badly contaminated with a high content of chlorides and sulfates.

"The Weber County underground water basin has been well explored by drilling, and most of the underground basins of the county produce water that cannot qualify under United States Public Health standards. Most of the industrial and domestic wells located in Ogden City have developed a chloride content in excess of 1,000 parts per million. A well drilled at the Utah General

Depot during the World War II period developed in excess of 2,000 parts of chloride per million and because it was unusable the well was concreted off and abandoned, with the result that the Utah General Depot is now dependent entirely on Ogden City's municipal water supply. Another well used by Ogden City located at Twenty-third Street and Van Buren Avenue, when first developed in 1944, produced a water of low chloride content but this has increased continuously so that it will soon have to be abandoned as a municipal supply. Other wells in Weber County south of Ogden City undoubtedly will increase in chloride content if pumped continuously, as there is a definite connection between the proven chloride area and the area to the south.

"The central section, representing the northern part of Davis County is producing usable water at the present time. However, it is the opinion of engineers that this area will encounter the same problem—excessive chlorides—if the underground basin is drawn on too heavily for supplemental water from pumped wells. This section's underground basin appears to be free from excessive chloride contamination but is being drawn upon heavily by the following military installations: Hill Air Force Base, Ogden Arsenal, naval supply depot, as well as a number of municipal and industrial wells which have been developed during the past 10 years. The records indicate that the high chloride and sulfide waters from the hot springs fault extending north from Beck's Hot Springs located just south of the southern line of Davis County are tending to spread through the basin as increased usage takes place. Also, contamination is spreading as a result of the use of the waters of the Jordan River for irrigation in the lower Davis County area. Objectionable quantities of sulfate are now showing in some of the south Davis County wells.

"The underground water basin in the southern section produces water carrying objectionable quantities of chlorides and sulfates, and as demands for water on this area are constantly increasing, resulting in increased pumping on the underground basin, the chloride and sulfide content of the water is constantly increasing in parts per million. Therefore, the underground water supply through the Davis and Weber County areas can be considered only a supplemental supply during peak-use periods and cannot be overdeveloped without jeopardizing the quality of the water now being produced. It appears essential that a new source of supply be made available for municipalities and military installations throughout Davis and Weber Counties.

"The second deterrent indicating a limited supply of water in the underground aquifers in the two counties involved is the lack of run-off water to fill these basins in times of high peak use and in years of low precipitation.

"PRECIPITATION, 1950-51

"Chart No. 4 shows annual precipitation data for this area for the last 50 years. The red blocks below the base line indicate years of below-average precipitation and the green blocks above show the years of above-average precipitation. It is interesting to note that precipitation has been far above average for the last 14 years, with the exception of 2 years, and each of these have been relatively near average.

"A review of the chart will show that there is no similar period of above-average precipitation in this 50-year record by the United States Weather Bureau.

"Another significant feature developed by the chart is the irrigation and municipal water consumption during the 50 years. The main trend upward in municipal water consumption began in 1939 at the time of the development of military bases in the Ogden area, and the irrigation consumptive trend began its upward climb in 1930 at the time the Echo Reservoir was constructed under the direction of the Bureau of Reclamation. These two trends are skyrocketing and yet the source of domestic water in this area has increased only by bringing into use underground water, and its content, as previously explained, is of doubtful quality; with accelerated drawing on the supply, the quality of necessity will decline in proportion.

"POPULATION GROWTH, 1940 AND 1950

"The population growth in municipalities of the area, especially Davis and Weber Counties, is a most significant factor in the depletion of an adequate water supply for the residents. The following tabulation was made from figures supplied by the United States Bureau of the Census and indicates clearly the tremendous increase in population that has taken place in the last decade, due primarily to the military installations established in this area.

	Population, 1940	Population, 1950	Percent increase
Total Davis County...	15,784	30,771	94.9
Bountiful.....	3,357	5,969	77.8
Centerville.....	691	1,267	83.3
Clearfield.....	1,053	4,675	344.0
Clinton.....	581	675	16.2
East Layton.....	124	216	74.2
Farmington.....	1,211	1,468	21.2
Fruit Heights.....	(1)	124	-----
Kaysville.....	1,211	1,899	56.8
Layton.....	646	3,454	436.5
Laytona.....	356	401	12.6
North Salt Lake.....	(1)	261	-----
South Weber.....	259	244	5.8
Sunset.....	276	989	258.3
Syracuse.....	732	837	14.3
West Point.....	236	431	82.6
West Bountiful.....	(1)	684	-----
Woods Cross.....	211	264	25.1
Totals of incorporated municipalities, Davis County.....	10,944	23,858	118.0
Total Weber County.....	56,714	83,032	46.4
Huntsville.....	496	494	.4
North Ogden.....	687	1,103	60.5
Ogden City.....	43,688	56,910	30.3
Plain City.....	(1)	828	-----
Pleasant View.....	(1)	420	-----
Riverdale.....	(1)	873	-----
Roy.....	998	3,709	271.6
South Ogden.....	1,407	3,764	167.5
Uintah.....	264	317	20.7
Total of incorporated municipalities, Weber County.....	47,540	68,418	43.9

¹Not incorporated in 1940.

"MILITARY BASES AND ACTIVITY

"Military operations in the Conservancy district are confined to Davis and Weber Counties. In the four installations—Utah General Depot, Ogden Arsenal, Hill Air Force Base, and Clearfield Naval Supply Depot—the Government has invested \$137,325,000 in property and buildings.

"All of these military bases are now alerted and constantly receiving from their various directive divisions in Washington or other headquarters new missions to perform, and are truly an important phase in the general preparedness and defense activities of our Nation.

"Chart No. 5 gives a clear picture of civilian employment, place of residence of these workers, and personnel increases at the installations.

"A recent review of the Hill Air Force Base follows. It shows specifically its expansion and the importance of uninterrupted continuation of operations. This case is typical of the other military installations.

"The work force at Hill Air Force Base

1. The civilian picture (as of May 23, 1951), (a) Strength of civilian work force as of May 23, 1951:

Authorized 9,272
Assigned 8,593

"(NOTE.—One year ago Hill Air Force Base had a civilian work force of 3,705. Peak strength of civilian work force during World War II was 14,000. This figure was reached on Apr. 1, 1943.)

"(b) Composition of work force by activity:

	Men	Women	Men and women
Maintenance.....	3,783	827	4,610
Supply.....	1,244	902	2,146
Others.....	1,572	265	1,837
Total.....	6,599	1,994	8,593

"Skilled and semiskilled trades, such as truck drivers, warehousemen, box makers, and laborers, salvage workers, heavy equipment operators and all building trades, such as plumbers, roofers, carpenters, etc.

"(c) Military veterans in the civilian work force: 3,399 men, 56 women (42 percent of present work force are veterans).

"(d) Total number of women in the civilian work force (May 11, 1951): 1,928 (1,101 live in Weber County, 590 live in Davis County).

"(e) An indication of the type of work (other than clerical, typing, and stenographic) performed by women: Aircraft material dispatchers, parachute servicers, aircraft engine repair helpers, aircraft painters and dopers, aircraft fabric and leather workers, packers, warehousemen, aircraft engine assemblers, laborers, custodians, etc.

"(f) Employment of physically handicapped:

"1. Number presently employed: 498.

"2. Types of physical handicaps: Blindness; defective hearing; amputees; diabetics; chronic diseases such as asthma, hypertension, cardiacs, tuberculosis, thyroid, nephritis; and miscellaneous irregularities such as dwarfism, ulcers, pregnancy, abdominal tumor, obesity, neuralgic disorders, and varicosity. There are 32 workers who are partially blind. These handicapped workers perform various tasks throughout the installation including the following: Leather and fabric workers, sheet-metal workers, custodians, parachute riggers, automotive storage workers.

"(g) Where the civilian work force was domiciled as of May 11, 1951:

Weber County:	
Ogden.....	3,558
Roy.....	322
Huntsville.....	17
Plain City.....	4
Eden.....	4
Croyden.....	2
Riverdale.....	2
Liberty.....	2
Hiawatha.....	2
Slaterville.....	1

Total (48 percent) 3,914

Salt Lake County:

Salt Lake City.....	1,436
Murray.....	33
Sandy.....	10
Midvale.....	9
Holladay.....	6
Draper.....	4
Granger.....	2
Kearns.....	2
West Jordan.....	1
Taylor.....	1
Riverton.....	1
Dragerton.....	1

Total.....1,506

Morgan County:

Morgan.....	87
Coalville.....	4
Croyden.....	2
Devils Slide.....	2

Total.....95

Davis County:

Layton.....	810
Clearfield.....	667
Kaysville.....	226
Sahara Village.....	162
Bountiful.....	121
Farmington.....	120
Hooper.....	80
Woods Cross.....	45
Centerville.....	31
Syracuse.....	2

Total (25 per cent).....2,264

Box Elder County:

Brigham City.....	185
Tremonton.....	20
Fielding.....	10
Bear River City.....	9
Garland.....	7
Willard.....	6
Corrine.....	5
Snowville.....	2
Deweyville.....	2
Mantua.....	1
Portage.....	1

Total.....248

Cache County:

Logan.....	115
Wellsville.....	18
Smithfield.....	8
Hyrum.....	7
Lewiston.....	6
Mendon.....	6
Richmond.....	5
Trenton.....	3
Paradise.....	1
Clarkston.....	1
Providence.....	1

Total.....171

"2. The military force at Hill Air Force Base: (a) The primary military force at Hill Air Force Base is the Twenty-fifth Air Depot Wing. Air depot wings are designed to render field and depot echelon maintenance and supply support to four combat (tactical) wings in an overseas operation.

"(b) The Twenty-fifth Air Depot Wing is at Hill Air Force Base primarily for training.

"(c) In an individual's process of being trained he works within the depot structure and contributes to the accomplishment of the depot's mission. In this sense he is a member of the work force and in most cases works side by side with civilians.

"(d) As of May 23, 1951, there were 694 married officers and airmen whose families resided locally. This number was domiciled within the Salt Lake Valley as follows:

Ogden.....	226
Weber County, exclusive of Ogden.....	93
Davis County.....	339
Salt Lake City.....	25
Salt Lake County, exclusive of Salt Lake City.....	11
Total.....	694

"(e) Based on records for past 6 months, the average time a military man has been stationed at Hill Air Force Base has varied between 8 and 14 months.

"WATER SUBSCRIBED FOR IN FIRST UNIT OF WEBER BASIN PROJECT

"We will review for a moment the feeling of the people in the incorporated areas and the more highly concentrated population areas of the counties of Davis and Weber. The conservancy district has not yet had the privilege of meeting with all of the municipalities to determine their tentative commitments as to the amount of domestic water they would like to subscribe for in the first unit of the Weber Basin project. The tabulation below is indicative of the trend. While some municipalities have not given firm commitments because they have not been contacted, the estimated amounts of water they will request in the first unit of the Weber Basin project are shown in the second schedule.

Tentative commitments received by Weber Basin water conservancy district to the present time

	Acre-feet
Apr. 12, 1951, Ogden City.....	10,000
Apr. 25, 1951, South Ogden City.....	800
May 7, 1951, Layton City.....	750
May 7, 1951, Clearfield City.....	1,000
May 10, 1951, Washington Terrace.....	900
May 11, 1951, Roy City.....	400
May 16, 1951, Bountiful City.....	1,000
May 16, 1951, Farmington City.....	270
May 17, 1951, Sunset.....	200
May 18, 1951, Riverdale Town.....	150
Total.....	15,470
Ogden Arsenal.....	1,000
Grand total.....	16,470

Estimate of commitments to be received from other municipalities in Davis and Weber Counties

	Acre-feet
Centerville.....	183
Clinton.....	163
East Layton.....	35
Fruit Heights.....	25
Kaysville.....	303
Laytona.....	61
North Salt Lake.....	76
Syracuse.....	134
West Point.....	113
Woods Cross.....	51
North Ogden.....	220
Plain City.....	336
Pleasant View.....	125
Huntsville.....	0

Total.....1,840

"It will be noted that Huntsville is the only incorporated community in these two counties that will not require additional water. It is located in Ogden Valley and is supplied at present with sources of spring water that are adequate for present needs and for a period of at least the next 10 years.

"ORGANIZATION OF WEBER BASIN WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT

"The Federal law creating the Weber Basin reclamation project provides that on a local level an organization be formed that has taxing power and has the legal ability and authority to contract with the Government and assume the responsibility for repayment

to the Government for the project works and facilities and the sole organization responsible to the Government in fulfilling those managerial and financial responsibilities.

"Such an organization has been formed, and is known as the Weber Basin water conservancy district. It is a political subdivision of the State of Utah and has broad powers. This district encompasses the counties of Davis, Morgan, Summit, and Weber. The area has an assessed valuation of \$115,000,000 and the district has power to levy a tax of one-half mill prior to construction of the works; subsequent thereto the district has power to raise this levy to one mill. The law enabling the creation of this district follows the principle of support from those who are indirect beneficiaries as well as those who participate in a direct way.

"The district is a firm entity, fully organized and prepared to enter into a contract with the United States Bureau of Reclamation for the purposes of assuming the responsibility of managing the works and of repayment to the Government of the project's reimbursable costs.

"FIRST UNIT OF THE WEBER BASIN PROJECT

"The total development of the Weber Basin project is a sizable financial and time-consuming undertaking. This \$70,000,000 project, however, is designed to be built in units. The first and most important is the Weber and Davis aqueducts transporting the water from the Weber River through open canals, tunnels, and pipelines to the various communities in the entire area. The aqueduct system should be supported by pertinent storage facilities, the raising of the Pine View Dam, and the construction of the Wanship Reservoir. If the area is to be relieved from facing disaster in case of a drought period the construction of the aqueduct and the diversion works at Stoddard on the Weber River is of prime necessity. These important facilities would be built at the earliest possible date following congressional approval, and while these first units would be inadequate from total basin area standpoint, definitely they would avert a serious catastrophe to the military, civilian, and industrial life of the area.

"NO OTHER SOURCE OF ADDITIONAL WATER

"We contend that there are no known sources of needed additional water available in the Ogden area for domestic and industrial purposes except the surplus water produced by the watersheds of the Weber Basin. The factual data of this brief is brought before you in an attempt to prove the very limited amount of water available from our creeks and streams and underground sources. It is our conviction that one or more years of drought, which the charts show are long overdue, would jeopardize the total civilian economy of the basin area and would reflect much production decrease in the area's total military accomplishments, affecting not only the military installations, as such, but all the contributing industrial elements of society, such as transportation and local sources of raw and fabricated material accessible to and urgently needed by these military installations.

"The Weber Basin project is our only hope for our present production and economy to be sustained in the event of a drought year. Thus it is our sincere belief that in the interests of military preparedness, even disregarding the general economy of the citizenry, the early start of the Weber Basin project, with the rapid completion of the first unit, is not only an urgent local necessity but a military and national defense necessity."

GOVERNMENT INSTALLATIONS IN AREA

Mr. FJELSTED. We would not be here urging that this project be initiated for con-

struction if we did not feel confident that it should be built in the interest of the national defense. I think I can easily prove that by the following data.

The Government has a tremendous direct interest in this project. There are four huge Government installations in the area—the Utah General Depot, the Ogden Arsenal, the Hill Air Force Base and the Clearfield Naval Supply Depot with a total Government investment for buildings and grounds of 137,000,000-plus dollars and over 3,000,000,000 in supplies. The Government is now increasing the total force at these bases. One of these—the Utah General Depot, is totally dependent on the municipal water supply of Ogden City. The railroads—which transport the material to and from these installations is one of the heaviest users of water in the area. Ogden is the largest railroad terminal between Omaha and the Pacific coast.

The population of the area has increased tremendously.

In Davis County, one of the counties which will benefit from this project, from 1940 to 1950 the population increased 118 percent. In Weber County, the other county which will benefit from this project, the population increased almost 45 percent. These tremendous population increases are directly traceable to the installations I have just mentioned.

INCREASE IN WATER CONSUMPTION

All this has resulted in a tremendous increase in the consumption of water in the area. The increase in municipal water consumption beginning in 1939 at the time of the development of the defense installations in Ogden and in the surrounding area was most heavy. Despite the tremendous increase in the consumption of water, the source of domestic water supply in this area is dwindling. Without this project, the only known source of domestic and industrial water in the area is from underground wells. We have been drilling deep wells in the area to augment the surface water supply.

Senator HAYDEN. What was the average depth, the pumping depth in years gone by? How deep do you go down for the water now? How far does the water table extend?

Mr. FJELDSTED. Not very much because we have a very small basin. It is a rechargeable basin. Our big trouble is the infiltration of chlorides and sulfides from the Hot Springs strata that goes through there. That is our underground water problem there.

Senator HAYDEN. You run into an undesirable supply of water?

Mr. FJELDSTED. That is right. In two of the major sections of the three the sulfides and chlorides are getting to a point where they do not reach United States health standard requirements. They go up as high as 2,000 parts per million.

Senator HAYDEN. Whereas, if you put fresh water on top of the ground and work it down, that balance would be restored?

Mr. FJELDSTED. That is right.

Senator HAYDEN. We had this same experience in the lower Gila Valley in Arizona. It was originally irrigated from the Gila River. The water would come on down. Then we built strong dams on the Gila, the Salt River, and the Verde River. There has not been any water for 10 years. The result is the wells they have put down are salt. It is to get away from that we are getting Colorado River water in the area. It is practically the same problem.

Mr. FJELDSTED. The fact of the matter is most of the industrial and domestic wells which are located in Ogden City at the present time have developed a chloride content in excess of one-thousandth parts per million, which is much above United States Public Health standards.

As the consumption and drawing on the wells continue, the chloride content of those wells which are still producing good water

will increase so that they also will become unproductive and unusable.

In this summary I have mentioned what, in my estimation, are the prime reasons for the approval by this committee and the Congress of the initial construction funds for the Weber Basin project. The direct defense needs—the direct interest that the Government has in seeing that the defense installations are not jeopardized should, if for no other reason, give this committee enough substantiating material to approve the funds we have requested.

The increase in consumption, a direct result of the increased population from these defense installations, is putting a tremendous burden on the known water supply. We are now in and have been in a particularly wet cycle. One or two dry years would so jeopardize the entire area that fire protection and other municipal responsibilities would be jeopardized.

I therefore urge that this committee approve the \$1,225,000 which has been requested to initiate the construction on this project.

Senator HAYDEN. We will ask the Reclamation Bureau to put in a justification for the project.

Would you read for the record what the total cost will be?

TOTAL COST OF PROJECT

Mr. FJELDSTED. Yes. The total cost will be \$70,000,000 for the total project. The initial unit we are talking about will be in the neighborhood of \$25,900,000.

Senator HAYDEN. And spread over how many years?

Mr. FJELDSTED. The initial project looks like it can be built in about 4½ to 5 years.

Senator HAYDEN. The immediate expenditure of this money is beginning to give you relief?

Mr. FJELDSTED. That is right.

Senator HAYDEN. We will next hear from Mayor White and then from Senator Watkins.

STATEMENT OF HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF UTAH

WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UTAH

Senator WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I have prepared a statement of several pages on this project, but I am not going to read that. I am going to ask that it be incorporated in the RECORD.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

"STATEMENT OF SENATOR WATKINS

"Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I endorse all that has been said by Mr. Fjeldsted, Mayor White, of Ogden, Utah, and my colleague, Senator BENNETT, as well as the general remarks regarding the necessity from a defense standpoint of continuing reclamation projects in the interest of our Nation's defense.

"In all respects, the Weber Basin project meets the criteria of a reclamation project necessary because of its close connection with the defense program of the Nation.

"This project consists of approximately 100,000 acres of land, and includes 70,000 acres of land not now irrigated, and 30,000 acres of land now partially irrigated. It is located in the north central part of Utah, just north of Salt Lake City, and contiguous to Ogden, Utah.

"This is a multiple-purpose project. It will develop the basin's remaining surplus water supply for irrigation and municipal needs. It will provide needed drainage outlets for the swamplands now not tillable. It will protect the area from flood damage; it will produce hydroelectric power for irrigation-pumping requirements and a little power for dump needs. It will increase the recreational opportunities of the citizens liv-

ing in the area and will improve the fish and wildlife resources.

"A water conservancy district has been organized to negotiate with the Federal Government for the repayment of the reimbursable construction costs.

"The members of the committee will recall, I am sure, that this project was authorized for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation under Public Law 273 of the Eighty-first Congress. When the President signed this bill, he directed the detailed information on allocation and repayment be secured and that other Government agencies be consulted in these matters. Since the approval of the bill, the President's stipulations have been and are being carried out. Studies are being made by the Bureau of Reclamation in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture and the State of Utah. A definite plan report complying with the President's request is in preparation and should be completed within the near future.

"The Bureau of the Budget has approved an allotment under general investigation funds for advance planning to continue with this work of preparing the definite plan report in fiscal 1952. However, the Bureau of the Budget has not approved and the Bureau of Reclamation has not provided for any construction funds in the fiscal 1952 budget. This means that before the end of 1952 all work on the project will be at a standstill. We feel that construction should be undertaken immediately on completion of the definite plan report to alleviate the critical need for water.

"In our western reclamation States of the arid West nothing is more important than water conservation and the maximum possible beneficial consumptive use of the water resources.

"The Supreme Court in a case involving a dispute between western reclamation States over the use of water, had this to say about the need for water in our Western States: "Each State depends for its existence primarily upon its natural resources, of which water in the arid regions is frequently the most valuable."

"We in Utah certainly know this to be the case. The Weber Basin project alone will furnish 40,000 acre-feet of water for municipal purposes to Ogden City, the second largest city in the State of Utah, and 22 other cities and towns in that area.

"My colleague, Senator BENNETT, has spoken about the urgent need of the cities and towns for the water because of the installation of the defense plants and for manufacturing and industrial usages. Mr. Fjeldsted and my colleague, Senator BENNETT, have discussed and portrayed the tremendous growth in population in the area. They have explained the increased needs and the burden which has been placed upon our dwindling water supply.

"I want to point out that even with the appropriation we have asked for—\$1,225,000—very little actual construction will take place. The funds will be used mainly to continue reconstruction surveys and to prepare designs and specifications. Some construction will be initiated on the initial features of the project.

"The most important features of the project to meet the immediate needs of the communities dependent upon this water supply are the Wanship Dam and Reservoir and the Weber aqueduct. While it will take several years to complete this phase of the project, the appropriations of the amount which has been requested will initiate the construction and will place us in a position whereby we cannot be accused of sabotaging the war effort in the event we are faced with a dry cycle in the area.

"It must also be stressed that the construction contemplated by this authorization will not require any manpower neces-

sary for any defense activities. Furthermore, no material considered critical or necessary in the emergency period ahead will be needed for this phase of the construction program on the Weber Basin project.

"I want to call the attention of the Appropriations Committee members to the fact that all these people living in this area are dependent upon the surrounding area for their fresh garden crops. The completion of the Weber Basin project, which, even with the appropriations we have asked for, will be 12 to 15 years off, will make these communities less dependent on outside areas for their garden and fruit crops.

"It should be kept in mind, however, that the completion of the project just referred to must be considered at this time separate and apart from the initial phase for which we are here making our request for funds. These funds are necessary to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction on the first phase of the project, the Wanship Dam and Weber aqueduct.

"I also feel that it is important for the committee members to keep in mind that this area can very likely become a haven for the people of the west coast who might be subjected to an attack in case of an all-out war on the coastal area, and, because of the situation we face in the Pacific area, such a possibility is not too remote. It will be possible to build homes rapidly in the area and provide shelter far from the immediate target areas of the Pacific Coast States. But to do so water would have to be available, and at the present time Utah, and especially the area of the Weber Basin project, now is facing a shortage of water.

"I recognize, as does my colleague, the necessity for economy in our operations if we are to remain solvent. Rest assured we would not be here urging funds to initiate construction on this project if we did not feel that it is in the best interest of our present defense program.

"We should always keep in mind that while we are spending billions of dollars for a war program, as well as billions of dollars in aiding foreign countries—such as we recently have done in France, where we have given them money to build an electric plant—that we should not lose sight of our needs in this country.

"We will not always be at war, and the men who are now serving in our Armed Forces will want to come back to farms, to industry, and to civilian activity. These projects will not be built overnight, and we cannot afford to completely stop all construction on these reclamation projects. Those that can be justified from a defense standpoint should be constructed. I am convinced Weber Basin falls within this category, and I urge as strongly as I can that the committee include in the appropriation bill \$1,225,000 to initiate construction of the Weber Basin project."

NATIONAL DEFENSE CONSIDERATIONS

Senator WATKINS. I do want to make a general statement about this entire project. In the first place, I want to make it perfectly clear as far as I am concerned I would not be here today asking for an appropriation on this project if I were not sincerely and fairly convinced that it is necessary to aid in the national defense effort in that particular area of the State of Utah and the West. I have taken the position we should not have big public works of any kind or description during this emergency unless they are directly related and can be effective in the defense effort. If the committee finds that we have not made a case—I do not think they will so find—but if they find we cannot make a case, then our request should not be allowed.

We are convinced, knowing the situation first-hand, that we do have a case. I think if the statements are read, you will find we do have that kind of a situation.

This project has been approved by the Congress unanimously. It is a large project, but that does not mean because it went by on the consent calendar in both Houses—in the House I think it went by on the two-thirds calendar or no votes against it—but that does not mean it was not explained. It was thoroughly explained in committee. I personally talked with many Members explaining just what it was, so eventually when we got to the point on the consent calendar there was no objection, although it was a \$70,000,000 project. It is almost incredible to believe in the area of Ogden, Utah, with that beautiful valley there, the extension of the Salt Lake Valley, that we have two streams running into the great Salt Lake City that annually waste 400,000 acre-feet of fresh water not now used for irrigation.

Senator YOUNG. Water is a scarce article.

ESTIMATED WATER SAVING

Senator WATKINS. It is almost incredible when I say this project will save 400,000 acre-feet annually. It is being wasted. It is not because the people there do not know the value of water. It is not because we have not tried. The fact is the people of Utah were the first Anglo-Saxons to put water to beneficial use, water for irrigation. They started the whole irrigation program in this country.

Senator YOUNG. You can almost make water go uphill.

Senator WATKINS. They have done a lot of things there. That used to be a saying there. They did that with force back of it, of course.

They have been interested in irrigation. This Weber project has been too big. It called for too much money. It called for an expensive planning program prior to the building of a project of this kind, too expensive for them to undertake from private capital. We have been long converted there that we should not ask the Government to do anything for us that we can do ourselves. We went as far as we could under our own steam to build. We will do everything now we can without calling on the Government.

Senator YOUNG. That was true during the relief days.

Senator WATKINS. We did have some relief, more than the people sometimes claim we did. The fact is the latter part of the depression we got busy there and tried to set up a situation that would take care of it. It was not 100 percent perfect, but it went largely in that direction.

The 400,000 feet of water are being wasted in the Weber and Ogden Rivers. This is a project that is cleverly worked out. It took a lot of thinking and planning. It cost considerable money to plan it so it could take care of it by exchange and putting in new reservoirs, some pumping, and that sort of thing.

Our cities and towns around Ogden are in a defense area. We have in that area Hill Field Air Base. I think 9,000 people are employed there.

ADJACENT GOVERNMENT PROJECTS

In that particular area we have four installations—Hill Field Air Base, Utah General Depot for the Army, Clearfield Naval Depot, and the Ogden Arsenal. That has increased the population by 118 percent since 1940. You know what that does to communities which are up to their limit of water supply at the time.

It is because nature has been kind to us for the last 10 or 11 years that we have not had any trouble. We have had a cycle of wet years. We will have a cycle of wet years and then to the contrary everything will burn up. We are alarmed for fear that we have drawn on good luck as long as we can, and we have to be prepared for this increased burden of population. That is not all of it.

If world war eventuates again with that inland situation, a protected position from the coast, we are likely to have thousands

of people who want to get away from cities like Portland, Seattle, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and the west coast cities that are vulnerable to an attack because of their large industries. We have to find some place up and down the entire mountain area for those people to go. We cannot take care of them without water. We now have no reserves whatever.

As I think the witnesses have told you, and I endorse everything they have said since I have seen their statements, we find that even the wells we have been sinking and depending on are becoming salty. The recharging of the wells is not taking place rapidly enough to keep fresh water available. There are some saline areas. It is just off the Salt Lake, you know. It is a 25-percent salt body, one of the strongest in the world. We will not have any wells if we do charge that area. The Government spent \$137,325,000 at these four big installations there. It is a great supply area with the railroads forking out of there to the north, south, west, and east. They are not likely to abandon that. It was chosen because of its strategic location. We cannot afford not to go ahead with the project that will insure us a supply of water when we have 400,000 acre-feet being wasted.

I might point out 40 percent of this water is needed for these cities and towns that have the people who have come there to work, a 118-percent increase in population. It has been a big burden in regard to the sewers and all these facilities that go for community life. These people are ready to do everything they can, but these mountain streams that come out of the Wasatch Mountains are very short. Drainage area is short and limited. In case of a drought they would go dry. We do not know what we would do with those people if we have one of those dry cycles hit us. We have been told this emergency may run on for 25 years. We should be looking ahead in that event. We cannot afford not to do the preliminary work and get this project lined up ready for construction.

CONSTRUCTION OF AQUEDUCT

I am not asking for the full project of \$70,000,000. The initial phase includes an aqueduct that comes out of the Weber River and divides it down when it comes out the canyon. Part of it would go to Ogden City to help take care of that area, a city which has increased its population tremendously. Mayor White has explained that. Then it would run to the south in Davis County and 14 smaller towns that get their water supply from it. That aqueduct ought to be built, by all means.

Suppose we did not get these facilities finished, but we ran into a short year for water. We have a law in our State that provides for domestic use, human consumption to be given a priority. We can take all the irrigation streams. In the event we got into a jam like that, we could not run water to these city people without this aqueduct, even if we could take the water away from the farms. It is a great truck-garden area, a fruit area, and one of the most profitable farming areas in the entire United States, for that matter, because they have been able to use irrigation water. They have a heavy demand for their food supplies.

As I said, we have been running through a cycle of wet years. We are at the end of our good luck, I think. We are fearful that is true. There is no reserve water left for Ogden City or any of these towns. They are all in the same fix. If they had a shortage, they would have to cut off the supply immediately and restrict the use of water.

The first stage of the project would call for this Weber-Davis aqueduct at a cost of \$20,000,000. They could go at that soon. They could start preliminary work in a short time. Part of it is a 3½-mile tunnel. That goes very slow. You have to start on this

early because it will hold up your whole deal. You can make the pipes and lay the rest of it, but you cannot dig those tunnels in a hurry.

AMOUNT FOR RESERVOIR

We have one reservoir that can be built for \$5,900,000. That will help regulate this Weber River.

There is another interesting phase of this Weber River. I do not know whether it has been mentioned here today, but each year during the so-called good years we have had trouble with this extra water coming down and flooding the farms. A good many people have built summer homes and they get flood problems.

AMOUNT REQUESTED

The Department of the Army and the Army engineers have had to go in there now several years in succession and help try to take care of the situation. They do not want to put in any permanent improvements because this reclamation project will harness the river and take care of that waste water. There will not be any left to flood anybody if we once get this going. Out of the \$70,000,000 authorized if we could get \$25,900,000, it will permit us to finish up the first phase. The construction plans are not finished. We have a staff working to gather the necessary data. If we do not get this money, they will not have money to finish that job. It is part of the construction work. It is the work that has to be done with blueprints, et cetera. That crew will have to be laid off, and it will take years to pick up again.

So from every angle I can think of in connection with this, at least the defense side of it, you have strong reasons why it ought to be built. Let us get over to the food supply.

In this same area they can put in additional land. That will not come under the first stage. That will come later. The whole project is fully justified. It is one that can repay construction costs. You were speaking of taxes returned and that sort of thing from these projects. We have one there now, a small one. I do not know why in the beginning we did not get this big one, but we do have a small one on the same river in the Ogden Valley. That is a small reclamation project. That project has brought in at least 10 to 1. The benefits have been at least 10 to 1 on the money expended. It has run into millions. That is where they have this Hill Field area. It requires a lot of water. There has been some charging of the lands with the new water supply, but no one dreamed we were going to have so many installations and we were going to have the large increase in population that we had.

THE PROVO RIVER PROJECT

During World War II, I was attorney for Provo River project, which supplies some water for Salt Lake City and the valleys to the south. We were given priority on metals and nearly everything to rush that project through because of the fact that they were sending in a large number of military personnel. They had Camp Kerns there, a city of nearly 60,000 people, which was brought in overnight. If we had not had that project, we could never have supplied that depot with water.

That wet cycle kept us from getting into trouble. We are just getting finished. That will take care of that area. I am pointing this up to you because the same arguments I am making now applied to that project and we got priorities on steel, concrete, and manpower to go ahead and get some of the essential features of that built.

Senator HAYDEN. I remember the representations you made distinctly.

WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UTAH

Senator WATKINS. I made those while I was an attorney for the project. For 14 years I had been working with reclamation before coming here. I have been exposed enough to it. If I have ever seen one justifiable from a defense basis it is this Weber Basin project. It is a crime that 400,000 acre-feet of water in that country are going to waste. Somebody asked me if it is an emergency. I said that any time you can find that amount of water being wasted there in the West, it is an emergency. It is a matter of manipulating and interchanging. These engineers have done a clever job of working that out so it can be used.

You can write an insurance policy for those defense areas, for the food supply, for the gardens, and keep the people satisfied. If we get it done, we could take care of more people in a hurry with trailer camps and temporary housing.

I want to emphasize with all the power I have the statements made by my predecessors before this committee today, and I want to point out that I think this committee and the Congress will be making a mistake if we do not get this project under way, at least get this initial stage done.

Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the eight projects are put in as a unit. The Senator from Michigan is not saying that the Utah project or the Idaho projects, as separate projects, would not be proper, but I desire to refer to the testimony of E. W. Rising, of Washington, D. C.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. In a moment. The testimony begins on page 2015 of the hearings. He presented a list of eight projects requiring funds in the amount of \$16,831,000. This is only a start. He lists the items. Anyone who will examine the record will see that he has taken the projects from certain States so as to make a unit, so as to log-roll the whole eight projects through the Senate of the United States.

I am not opposing the right to vote upon the Utah project or any other separate project. What I am objecting to today is finding the Senate in the position in which it is, where it is offered these projects in a total of 8 to be considered as one project.

I now yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, if the Senate had a program the adoption of this amendment would violate every principle for which those who have been advocating economy have been standing. There was no budget estimate for any one of these eight projects. I do not claim there was any log-rolling among the eight States affected. It is significant, however, that the former employee of a construction firm divided up \$12,000,000 in eight Western States. No reference whatever was made in the House hearings to these projects. No action was taken on them by the House. When our committee considered the bill, we added \$23,000,000 and, in my opinion, we added that much too much. It would be a farce now to take \$12,026,000 for projects in eight Western States and add it to the total when we do not have a budget estimate for that amount.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that the total cost of these projects—and this is only a start—is \$295,467,000.

I now wish to yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has 2 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield a minute to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it looks as if the righteous economy blaze had fizzled out. The bill comes from the House, and there is an increase by the Senate committee of \$23,000,000. It is now proposed to add \$12,000,000 more. While we are raising appropriations, another committee of the Senate is sweating over the idea of diminishing the amount involved in the revenue bill which is now pending.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. With all due deference to my splendid colleague from Illinois I invite attention to the fact that whether his State was included in this new movement for free gifts, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] cast the deciding vote in the committee that killed it in the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have not reflected upon any Member of the Senate. I am reflecting upon the fact that many of us took a solemn vow that we would try to do something for economy. We find it very difficult in a bill of this kind. The committee comes in with increases. Why talk about inflation? Why talk about controls? Why talk about curbing this sort of thing when the Congress itself is responsible for the principal factor, namely, feeding extra millions and millions of dollars into the bloodstream of the country to kick off the price level? Maybe the blaze has fizzled out, but, in my humble way, I shall do the best I know how along the line of economy, notwithstanding the ultimate result which is achieved here in increased appropriations.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I yield the rest of my time to the senior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I desire to reiterate what has already been said. These projects were not approved by the Bureau of the Budget, or by any official of the Government. They were approved by someone who is acting as a lobbyist. He was the only one who appeared before the committee with reference to these projects. He was Mr. E. W. Rising, of Washington, D. C.

This is a very remarkable case, Mr. President. Here is an appropriation of \$16,000,000, and no one appears in connection with it, so far as the record is concerned, except someone who is lobbying, and who represents construction companies, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is not correct. There were other witnesses who appeared with reference to these projects.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator give the page number? I have read the record, and all I could find was the statement of this man Rising. Who is he?

Mr. HAYDEN. He represents a group of conservation agencies in the State of Idaho. His principal compensation is from that organization.

Mr. BYRD. Is he a lobbyist or a contractor—

Mr. FERGUSON. He is a former employee of a contractor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The time for debate has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is my understanding correct that if this amendment to increase the total by \$12,000,000 is agreed to, the amendment which I intend to offer to cut a total of \$16,000,000 will be out of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be out of order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it be appropriate for me to say, therefore, that I hope this amendment will be voted down?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, has the time expired on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum so that we can vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	McClellan
Anderson	Hayden	McFarland
Bennett	Hendrickson	McKellar
Bricker	Hennings	Millikin
Bridges	Hill	Monroney
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Morse
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Mundt
Byrd	Humphrey	Neely
Cain	Hunt	Nixon
Capehart	Ives	O'Connor
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Clements	Kerr	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Langer	Stennis
Duff	Lehman	Taft
Dworshak	Lodge	Thye
Eastland	Long	Underwood
Eaton	Magnuson	Watkins
Ellender	Malone	Welker
Ferguson	Maybank	Wherry
Frear	McCarthy	Williams
Fulbright		Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on the pending amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], including eight projects, which would increase the amount in the committee amendment on page 18, line 21, from \$208,344,450 to \$220,561,450.

On that amendment the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official committee business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has a general pair on this vote with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would each vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation, and is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay" and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If present and voting the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—30

Anderson	Humphrey	McCarthy
Bennett	Hunt	McFarland
Butler, Nebr.	Johnson, Colo.	Millikin
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Mundt
Dworshak	Kerr	Neely
Ellender	Langer	Watkins
Hayden	Long	Welker
Hennings	Magnuson	Wherry
Hill	Malone	Young

NAYS—45

Aiken	Ferguson	McKellar
Bricker	Frear	Monroney
Bridges	Fulbright	Nixon
Butler, Md.	George	O'Connor
Byrd	Hendrickson	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Hoey	Pastore
Carlson	Holland	Robertson
Case	Ives	Saltonstall
Clements	Kerr	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Knowland	Stennis
Douglas	Lehman	Taft
Duff	Lodge	Thye
Eastland	Maybank	Underwood
Eaton	McClellan	Williams

NOT VOTING—21

Benton	Jenner	Russell
Brewster	Kefauver	Smathers
Connally	Martin	Smith, N. J.
Flanders	McCarran	Smith, N. C.
Gillette	McMahon	Sparkman
Green	Moody	Tobey
Hickenlooper	Murray	Wiley

So Mr. HAYDEN's amendment, as modified, in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the body of the RECORD, just prior to the vote on the Hayden amendment, I may be permitted to insert a short statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON RE APPROPRIATIONS FOR YAKIMA PROJECT, KENNEWICK DIVISION, COLUMBIA BASIN, STATE OF WASHINGTON

The Senator from Arizona, last Thursday, offered an amendment to this bill proposing an addition of \$12,026,000 to the amount provided by the Committee for Construction and Rehabilitation, Bureau of Reclamation. The purpose of the addition is to finance initial construction on eight reclamation projects—located in eight States of the West.

The subcommittee on Interior appropriations voted to include these eight projects in its report to the full committee. The full committee rejected this particular subcommittee recommendation by a vote of 11 to 10. Ten members of the full committee, therefore, believe as I do that it is in the national interest to get these eight projects under way.

One of the projects included in the Hayden amendment is the Kennewick division of the Yakima project in my State. The amount involved is \$1,174,000. While I am primarily interested in this project, my interest extends beyond that to the reclamation program in every part of the West.

Before speaking directly to the Kennewick division I want to speak briefly to a point which I know will be raised in the minds of some Senators, namely, "Should we at a time like this be appropriating funds to bring new land into production?" To put it another way, some will ask: "With all the demands of defense mobilization, can we afford the additional strain represented by those projects?" Or to put it still another way, some will say: "Can't the reclamation program be slowed down or deferred until

we have passed through the present international crisis?"

No one knows how long the international tension will last. No one can foresee how long we must remain in a state of preparedness. Best guesses are that we must look forward to a 10- or even 20-year period of semimobilization. If that is the prospect we face, it seems obvious that we cannot as a Nation afford to place on ice, so to speak, all efforts to develop our resources.

As a matter of fact there is compelling argument for accelerating that development—particularly in those cases where the resource itself will return development costs to the Treasury. The reclamation program for the West should be kept going at a sensible level. It is with this thought and in this spirit that those of us from the West direct your attention to our projects.

I am sure the Senate is already familiar with the Yakima project and the Kennewick division thereto. I have spoken here on the floor several times, urging construction funds to complete the project.

Last year Bureau of the Budget authorized the Department to request \$175,000 for designs and planning on the Kennewick. This year \$44,000 was cleared for the same purpose.

The Department however, requested \$1,550,000 to put the project into the construction phase. This represents about one-sixth of the total cost. Bureau of the Budget deleted this item from the appropriation request last year and again this year.

Denial of construction funds was based on the mistaken assumption the Kennewick division is a new start. The Senate knows that budget has adhered to a policy, in the last 2 years, of no new starts.

Later in my remarks, I want to touch on the no-new-start policy because I think that policy is wrong. First, however, I direct my remarks to the erroneous assumption that Kennewick is a new start.

Senators who are members of the Appropriations Committee will recall last year's discussion on this point. I appeared before the House Appropriations Committee to argue the case. Congressman JACKSON of Washington, himself a member of the House Appropriations Committee, did likewise. The House committee concurred in our contention that the Kennewick division, as its name implies, is an integral part of the Yakima project, and the Yakima project has been under construction for over 40 years. It is one of the oldest projects of the Bureau.

The Kennewick contract itself is dated April 7, 1921, and calls for diversion of 150,000 acre-feet of water. The other divisions of the Yakima project are Sunnyside, Tleton, Kittitas, and Roza. They are either completed or rapidly nearing completion.

Going back to the decision reached by the House committee, I quote from page 172 of the report on the general appropriations bill for 1951. The committee said:

"The President's budget message on page M-65 contains the following statement: 'The activities of the Bureau of Reclamation and the flood-control program of the Corps of Engineers, involving the construction of dams, power facilities, canals, channels, and levees, will be limited in 1951 to continuation of work on projects started in prior years.'

"The committee does not agree with the determination of the Bureau of the Budget in rejecting appropriations for the construction of the Kennewick division, Yakima project, Washington, under this expression of policy. The committee has considered this division and has determined that it is not a new project but is part of the Yakima project under such policy."

After hearing our argument, the Senate committee included a paragraph on page 146 of its report which says:

"The committee concurs with the determination of the House Appropriations Committee on page 172 of its report No. 1797 to the effect that the Kennewick division of the Yakima project 'is not a new project but is a part of the Yakima project.'"

In view of these decisions by the two committees of the Congress, I find it most difficult to understand the failure to include construction funds for the Kennewick division in this year's budget. In my judgment, it is entirely proper that the Senate should now proceed on its own initiative to implement the decision it reached last year, when we approved the committee action—just referred to. I strongly urge you to do this by adopting the Hayden amendment.

Just a brief comment on the policy of "no new starts." There has been a regrettable tendency—both in the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress—to dry up the reclamation program at its source. I refer to the repeated cuts that have been made in the appropriation for general investigations.

I am sure Bureau of the Budget cut the original request of the Reclamation Commissioner for funds under this heading. As the Budget came from the President, however, there was included \$5,500,000 for financing surveys and investigations. The House committee clipped this to \$5,000,000. On the House floor the item was clipped an additional 20 percent to \$4,000,000.

Unless the Bureau of Reclamation has a reasonable amount of money to finance surveys and investigations, there will be "no new starts," because there will be no plans whatever on which to make a new start. Funds expended for this activity are a good investment. As a matter of fact, I am quite sure some of our projects in the West would be better projects had there been more investigation. You cannot have a shelf of reclamation work without surveys—and unless we keep a minimum program going, the engineering talent assembled over the years by the Bureau will disintegrate. You cannot put that kind of an organization together overnight.

So I conclude that a policy of "no new starts" too long pursued is detrimental to the West and to the Nation. The Congress itself sets policy on these matters. We are not bound by the decisions of the executive branch, nor should we be.

I speak to you today as a representative of one of the eight Western States affected by the Hayden amendment. Senators from the other affected States have spoken or will speak. In pleading for our particular projects, however, we in reality are pleading for the entire reclamation program. Let's not have it die on the vine—let's keep it going at a sensible level.

To do this we must have some new starts and we must go forward to completion of some of our older projects—like the Kennewick division of the Yakima project.

I reiterate my earlier statement. The Department of the Interior requested \$1,550,000 for the Kennewick in fiscal 1952.

The Hayden amendment includes \$1,174,000 for the project. I hope the Senate adopts this amendment—thereby supporting the judgment of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee on this matter of vital importance, not only to the West but to the entire Nation.

EXPLANATION OF HAYDEN AMENDMENT

MR. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to that amendment, and then ask that it go over and remain pending. I ask that the amendment to the committee amendment which I now offer may be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, line 21, in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted

by the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert the following: "\$220,370,450, of which not to exceed \$29,160,408 shall be available for personal services, and"

On page 18, line 23, in lieu of the figure proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert "33,896,650."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over.

MR. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in explanation of what I propose to do, I may say that in my opinion we should not approve of the "no new starts" policy adopted by the Bureau of the Budget during the past two fiscal years with respect to appropriations for the development of the natural resources of the Nation. As a result of that policy the sums made available for the four major development agencies out of the total appropriations of \$81,402,455,787 for the fiscal year 1951 were for reclamation 0.33 percent, for flood control and river harbors 0.76 percent, for soil conservation 0.41 percent, and for highways 0.47 percent, or a total of less than 2 percent, being actually 1.98 percent of the total appropriations made last year for those four purposes.

The curtailment of such internal improvement projects has been justified by the Bureau of the Budget by asserting that labor and materials should be diverted from them to direct use in the national defense effort required by the threat of armed Communist aggression. But the threat of aggression is quite certain to exist for a considerable period of years and new wealth created from the Nation's natural resources will be greatly needed to sustain the effort to defeat it. It is therefore sound public policy to deviate a reasonable part of the total Federal expenditures to capital investments in wealth-producing projects which will be repaid by increased revenues derived from taxing income and profits which would otherwise not exist.

I am, therefore, offering the amendment, and I propose to have it allocated to eight different projects. It would initiate construction of these projects, for all of which estimates were submitted by the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget, and disapprove the attitude of the Bureau of the Budget toward new-starts projects. They are projects which will put to work water now going to waste to the seas to grow crops, make homes, support people, produce power for urban, rural, and industrial uses, and increase Federal revenues from taxation.

MR. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a summary of the projects or units proposed, showing the amount to be allocated out of the \$12,026,000, and indicating how much money will be used on each project.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Projects or units proposed additional to budget estimates

Project or unit	Total estimated cost	Proposed for fiscal year 1952
1. Solano project, California.....	\$38,745,000	\$2,500,000
2. Palisades project, Idaho.....	76,601,000	2,500,000
3. Weber Basin project, Utah.....	69,534,000	1,000,000
4. Yakima project, Kennewick division, Washington.....	10,736,000	1,174,000
5. Riverton project, Wyoming, Muddy Ridge canal and laterals.....	4,385,670	250,000
6. Missouri River Basin project:		
(a) Lower Marias unit, Montana.....	64,065,000	2,500,000
(b) Sargent unit, Nebraska.....	10,671,000	1,227,000
Jamestown unit, North Dakota.....	10,740,000	875,000
Additional projects or units.....	295,467,000	12,026,000

"The reasons for the inclusion of appropriations for these projects may be summarized as follows:

"1. Solano project, California: The \$2,500,000 recommended will enable contracts to be let to start construction of Monticello Dam to provide supplemental water for the city of Vallejo, vital defense installations, and an important irrigated food-production area.

"2. Fallsades Dam, Idaho: The \$2,500,000 recommended will permit completion of highway relocation and initiation of construction of the dam. The Defense Electric Power Administration has approved the project which will have 112,500 kilowatts of power capacity. By supplemental water, the dam will later stabilize and increase production on 650,000 acres of irrigated land in Snake River Valley.

"3. Weber Basin, Utah: The \$1,000,000 recommended for this project will enable a contract to be let to bring vitally needed water for irrigation, municipal, and defense needs to the vicinity of Ogden.

"4. Kennewick division, Washington: The \$1,174,000 recommended will assure a start toward obtaining irrigated crops that are needed in a critical area of the Hanford atomic energy development where more than 80,000 new population has created a serious food problem. Both the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations have held that this division is a continuation of construction of the successful Yakima project.

"5. Riverton project, Wyoming: The committee has increased the amount of this project from \$855,740 allowed by the House to \$1,150,000 to permit construction to start on the Muddy Ridge canal to serve 30,000 acres of public land that will be made available for settlement by veterans. Construction of the Riverton project has been extended over 30 years with consequent increasing costs and overhead and should be completed as rapidly as possible.

"6. Missouri River Basin project—(a) Lower Marias unit, Montana: The \$2,500,000 allocation will permit award of contract for construction of the Tiber Dam for irrigation storage to stabilize agriculture in an area frequently devastated by drought where an assured supply of livestock feed is essential. An appropriation to commence construction of this project during the 1951 fiscal year was impounded by the Bureau of the Budget because of its 'no new starts' policy.

"(b) Sargent unit, Nebraska: The \$1,227,000 allocation will permit award of contract for the Millburn diversion dam to divert supplemental water from Middle Loup River to provide livestock feed and other irrigated-crop production in an area of highly productive land greatly in need of supplemental water."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is designated "7-6-51-B."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, line 21, in the committee amendment, as amended, it is proposed to strike out "\$208,535,450" and insert in lieu thereof "\$192,261,450."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Illinois that his amendment in that form would not be in order, because the House and Senate have already fixed the figure of \$208,535,450, and unless the Senator's amendment covers more items than that one it cannot be considered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am at the moment quite unable to understand the ruling of the Chair. Does the Chair rule that we have already approved the figure "\$208,535,450"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That figure has already been fixed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am completely surprised on this matter. When did we approve the figure of \$208,535,450?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate adopted the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to the committee amendment, and it adopted that figure. So that figure alone would not be subject to further amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HAYDEN. What the Chair has stated is rather surprising to me. I think the Senator from Illinois ought to have an opportunity to offer his amendment. The action which was taken the other day when the Senator from California offered his amendment was not intended to foreclose Senators from an opportunity of this kind. I ask unanimous consent—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, by unanimous consent, the Senator from Illinois may offer his amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I fully agree with what the Senator from Arizona has said. When I rose the other day I asked that this purely minor change, adding the amount of \$191,000 at this point and deducting it from operation and maintenance, be made without prejudice to the further offering of amendments. If I had not felt assured that that was so, I would not have pressed the amendment. So I hope unanimous consent will be granted, in fairness to the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I gather that there has been some unorthodox parliamentary procedure, in which I am perfectly willing to concur. However, I have an amendment which I wish to offer in this same line and the same item in the bill. Since the amendment of the Senator from California was not considered to be within the general procedures of the Senate, and in view of the fact that the Senator from Illinois may still offer an amendment, which means an amendment in the third degree, I wish to preserve for the Senator from Minnesota the right to offer an amendment in connection

with the same figure, without being foreclosed by the action of the Parliamentarian or the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is only ruling on the question presented. The Chair will read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 5, 1951, on page 7829:

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President; I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from California may offer his amendments now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The first amendment offered by the Senator from California will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, line 21, it is proposed to strike out "\$208,344,450", and insert "\$208,535,450."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

That leaves the item not subject to further amendment, except by unanimous consent. Is there objection to granting unanimous consent to the Senator from Illinois to offer an amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Just a moment. I do not understand, from the reading of the RECORD, that unanimous consent was given for the consideration of the amendment of the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That was done on July 5.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not think the RECORD shows that. It merely states that the amendment was adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was adopted by the Senate. Having been adopted, that figure is fixed as the action of the Senate, and that question cannot be considered again without unanimous consent. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Just a moment, Mr. President.

First of all, we have been foreclosed so far as debate is concerned. There is a 15-minute limitation which was arrived at without consultation with some of us who are very much interested in the bill. Secondly, we now find an unorthodox procedure in the consideration of amendments. The Senator from Minnesota has an amendment. He has been told that that amendment cannot be offered at this point in the bill if the amendment which is now being considered is adopted. If the Hayden amendment had been adopted, I would have been foreclosed. If we are to give special treatment to the Senator from California and his amendment, and if we are to give special treatment to my friend from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and his amendment, the Senator from Minnesota wants, not special treatment, but the same kind of treatment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Minnesota that the question which he mentions will arise when he offers his amendment. There is no way by which the Chair can rule in advance on that question. The only question now before the Senate is whether or not unanimous consent shall be given to the Senator

from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to offer his amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, let me suggest to the Senator from Minnesota that there is a way in which he can offer his amendment after the entire subject matter is closed. He can offer a proviso at the end of the bill, after all the committee amendments are disposed of, to provide that so much of this money may be used for a certain purpose, increasing the amount by that sum. Then the amendment will stand by itself, and the Senate can vote on it. The Senate can always add a proviso to an appropriation bill if it so desires. That is the way to accomplish the purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very happy to receive that confirmation, because that is what I wanted to get perfectly clear. There has just been a unanimous consent agreement to limit debate. I have an amendment. If my rights are protected, so that I may offer my amendment, I shall not object to the pending request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to granting unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois may offer his amendment? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, first I wish to thank the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] for his courtesy in permitting my amendment to save \$16,000,000 to be put before this body. It is an exhibition of a very fine spirit of sportsmanship. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. President, I believe we should take stock as to just where we are in relationship to the budget as a whole. The President's message of January called for expenditures of approximately \$71,500,000,000. That figure has been increased by about a billion and a half dollars in supplemental requests since then, so we now have a total request of about \$73,000,000,000 before us. The present tax rates will probably not yield more than \$61,000,000,000 for the coming year. Consequently we face a deficit of \$12,000,000,000. This can only be made up by both (a) a reduction in expenditures and (b) an increase in taxes. The precise proportion which we are to use as between those two methods has of course not yet been decided. Some say it should be 50-50, namely, a six billion cut in expenditures and a \$6,000,000,000 increase in taxes. I am certain that no one believes that the cut can be less than \$5,000,000,000, and that we shall have to save at least \$5,000,000,000 from the total budget of approximately \$73,000,000,000.

There are certain items in the \$73,000,000,000 of expenditures which will be very difficult to cut. The interest on the public debt, which will be over \$5,500,000,000, cannot for example be reduced. The veterans' pensions cannot be reduced. The grants to the States for old age assistance and for dependents' assistance cannot be reduced.

Probably \$12,000,000,000 of appropriations, approximately, are completely fixed beyond the power of Congress to reduce.

Therefore we shall have to make our savings of \$5,000,000,000 from a total of not much more than \$60,000,000,000. Of

that \$60,000,000,000, about \$41,000,000,000 or \$42,000,000,000 will be expenditures for national defense. I believe we can reduce expenditures for national defense without diminishing combat efficiency, by reducing the waste in the military outlay. It is difficult for Congress to do it, and certainly it is probably true that we cannot apply as large a percentage of cuts to the defense items that we can apply to the nondefense items.

Roughly I form the general division of reductions in my mind about as follows: That we can reduce defense items by approximately \$2,000,000,000, and that we can reduce foreign aid by something less than a billion dollars. Therefore we must cut nondefense domestic items by two to two and a half billion dollars.

Mr. President, if you will follow out these items, you will find that this requires not far from a 20-percent reduction in expenditures for domestic and nondefense items.

In the case of the Interior Department, the appropriations for which we are now considering, the committee has proposed a gross reduction of \$44,000,000, or a percentage cut of 8 percent below the budget estimate. This is good, but it is not good enough. In my judgment we shall have to cut the Interior Department's appropriations by at least 12 percent, if we are to get the budget to the balanced state which, presumably, we are all theoretically trying to do.

In the amendment before us I am proposing a reduction of approximately \$16,000,000, from a rounded total of \$208,000,000 to \$192,000,000, or a saving of about 8 percent. On other items in the Interior Department appropriations I intend to propose reductions of approximately \$8,000,000, making the overall reduction of an additional 4 percent for all items in the Interior Department bill as a whole.

The proposal of a \$16,000,000 cut for the reclamation items is not excessive, in my judgment. It means the elimination of one project, approximately a 10-percent slow-down in the rate of construction of four other irrigation projects, which will be carried on but at a 10-percent slower rate than normally, and a cut-back in planning funds for the Missouri Basin. A full description of how my amendment would affect these projects can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 6 at pages 7900-7901.

In view of the emergency with which we are faced, a 10-percent slow-down on 4 out of the 35 projects included in this bill seems to me to be sensible. There is one exception provided. In the case of the Missouri Basin project I am proposing substantially a 20-percent slow-down on irrigation and also a reduction in the expenditures for plans for the Missouri project.

I wish we could have considered the item of plans and investigations before we took up the construction. However, because of the agreement with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] we did not do it. I wish to say that the Bureau of Reclamation has already drawn up plans

for three to four billion dollars' worth of irrigation work. The plans for this are all drawn. We have a big backlog there. Now they are proposing, both in the item prior to this one and in the western Missouri item, to appropriate more millions to plan still further projects beyond these three billion to four billion dollars, for which they already have drawing-board plans, and they wish to draw plans to take still more billions of dollars in the future.

I may say that we have plans and plans and plans for river and harbor improvements and for irrigation projects. We can spend billions of dollars on the plans we already have. Why spend millions now in this period of national emergency to draw still further plans? Sometimes I think that the Bureau of Reclamation has the slogan:

Draw me more stately plans, O my soul.

I believe it is about time that we cut down on these items. Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that the reduction of \$16,000,000 will be approved by the Senate.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to my friend from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator from Illinois realize that both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party have wholeheartedly endorsed in their platform for the last 8 to 10 years a reclamation program? Does he realize also that such a program is in accordance with the promises of both political parties of the United States to the voters of the country, particularly to the people of the West?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend from Utah that in the first place, my amendment would permit quite a substantial reclamation program to be carried out—a \$192,000,000 program. In the second place, the planks to which he refers were adopted in a period of peace. We are not now in a period of peace. We are in a period very close to war. We look forward to an uncertain future. In view of the uncertain future, we simply do not have the resources for all irrigation projects which are proposed and at the same time also for the guns, battleships, airplanes, and other military resources which we need.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I gladly yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator's proposal is not directed against reclamation as such, but in view of the emergency in which we find ourselves, it is merely aimed at delaying such projects for a very short time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. May I point out to the Senator that what he is talking about is based on the record of the Bureau of Reclamation in making the investigations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am talking not only about that, but I am talking also about the necessity of slowing down the construction of irrigation projects.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Let me call the Senator's attention to one project which is practically finished. All we have left to complete is a tunnel. It is nearly two-thirds completed. It has been under construction since 1936. It started off as a \$7,500,000 project. It is now up to eighteen or nineteen million dollars. Would the Senator be in favor of slowing down on the construction of the tunnel, and make it impossible to get the water which it is necessary to have in order to use the rest of the project? Is that economy?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is the Senator from Utah opposing my motion in my time or in the time of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]?

Mr. WATKINS. I asked the Senator from Illinois to yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I request that the time be charged to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. WATKINS. I asked the Senator to yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. How much longer will it take to finish?

Mr. WATKINS. I have asked my question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. How much longer will it take to finish it. I mean the tunnel, not the speech.

Mr. WATKINS. It can be finished this year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My proposal is that it be finished in a year and a tenth, instead of a year. Is it so urgent that it must be finished in 12 months, rather than 13 months and 6 days. I am proposing that the rate of construction be slowed down by one-tenth.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, let me point out to the Senator from Illinois—

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator is about to point out something I should like to ask that he point it out in the time of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. WATKINS. Very well.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on the pending amendment be increased to 30 minutes on a side, instead of 15 minutes. I have had many requests for time to speak, and I am certain the same is true on the other side of the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the request is that the unanimous-consent agreement be modified in order to provide 30 minutes to each side, instead of 15, on this amendment only.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to go along with the distinguished chairman of the committee. However, if we are going to begin such a process with the amendments, there will be no end to it.

So it seems to me we should try to adhere to the unanimous-consent agreement. If the chairman of the committee insists on changing it, all right; but I hate to see such a process begun.

Mr. HAYDEN. I state frankly that I know of no other amendment to the bill which will require additional time.

Mr. WHERRY. Why not use some of the time available on the bill?

I ask that the chairman of the committee amend his request for additional time by requesting that the additional minutes to be allowed to each side on this amendment be taken from the time available for debate on the bill under the unanimous-consent agreement. In that way, 30 minutes will be available to each side for debate on this amendment, by means of a decrease of 15 minutes in the time available to each side for debate on the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Very well; I so modify my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modified unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arizona?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 or 3 minutes to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; I am glad to do so. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to present briefly a point of view which is in direct conflict with the observations just presented to the Senate by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. CORDON. I should like to state that the importance of this amendment is such as to require a better attendance on the floor of the Senate, if that can be arranged. Therefore, will the Senator yield in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CAIN. I shall be very pleased to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time required for the quorum call will have to be taken out of the time available for debate on the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time required for the quorum call be charged to both sides, one-half to be deducted from the time available to each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington desires to speak, and I yield to him.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. I speak briefly for two reasons. One reason is that I believe that many of our colleagues are completely in support of a continuing development of the Columbia River Basin; and I take it they will add to what I shall say.

A reduction of \$2,600,000 in the amount allowed by the Senate Appropriations Committee, as suggested by the Senator from Illinois, would seriously retard the construction program on the Columbia Basin project. Of the \$29,900,000 requested for fiscal year 1952, approximately \$22,600,000 is for irrigation facilities. The total amount requested has been cut by the House and Senate to \$27,000,000, and it is now proposed to reduce further the amount requested for irrigation by \$2,600,000.

Approximately 6,700 acres are now under irrigation, and it is anticipated that 67,814 acres will be fully irrigated and made available for farm units in fiscal 1952, leading toward a 200,000-acre goal by 1955. These farm units will contribute substantially to the production of food for the rapidly increasing population in the coastal States.

Work is progressing on the pumping plant situated behind the Grand Coulee Dam on Roosevelt Lake. The pumps are being installed and tested. Pumping is now taking place on the first completed unit, and the equalizing reservoir is being filled and seasoned. Similarly, the primary canals and structures are under construction, and the lateral systems for the distribution of the waters from the canals to the farm lands has just been initiated, involving at the present time about \$96,000,000 in contracts now in force, which contracts will require approximately \$18,000,000 for their continuation. With the \$2,600,000 cut which is proposed by our friend from Illinois, that would reduce further construction in fiscal 1952 to approximately \$6,400,000 for the future work on the project primarily for irrigation facilities.

It should be pointed out that the program of development of the farm areas in the Columbia Basin is consistent with the President's program, and it has been well known to the Bureau of the Budget and Congress for several years. Any reduction in funds at this time would prevent proper development of the project works and would allow for only the completion of the primary water-carriage system and, further—and we are talking in terms of being economy-minded in these days—it would increase the cost to the Government due to delay and rising costs. It is obvious, at least to me, that such a system standing idle with the huge investment already made is wasteful, and that the full amount should be provided for the construction of the coordinated lateral systems so that the landowners can put their units into production.

I appreciate the time yielded me by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, for the reason that when construction contracts are let on reclamation projects and it becomes necessary for the contractors to assemble their crews and perfect their organization, in order that they may proceed to the construction, if they are slowed down by 10 percent or 20 percent, it interferes with that activity; and in the case of the project in Utah, which I mentioned, it may mean a big claim against the Government in the United States Court of Claims, for failure of the Government to go on with its part of the contract.

The Utah project, known as the Provo River, is about finished. It needs an additional sum this year, which the committee has recommended, in order that the project may be finished. It is in the general construction funds item. If that fund is cut, it means that its construction, including finishing the tunnel, from which the project will get one-third of its water supply will be delayed and the tunnel cannot be used, although much money is tied up in it.

The project was begun in 1934, contracts were let in 1936, as I recall, and it has taken all these years to construct what started out to be a \$7,500,000 contract. The cost has now advanced to \$18,000,000. It should have been finished before the beginning of World War II. Every year of delay has meant an additional increase in cost to the water users and to the people who are dependent on the project.

It seems to me that a cut in this construction fund will not be any economy whatever, but will in the end result in increased costs on many of these projects, because the contractors will not be able to carry on. They will lose their crews; they will suffer damages; and they will immediately come into the Court of Claims to recover damages. Since these projects are all underway, and most of them are under contract, they should be finished, and there should be no cut in this particular appropriation.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I do not presume that it would be possible to influence the distinguished Senator from Illinois in the least regarding this matter, but I wonder whether he really understands what he is attempting to do in proposing this drastic cut. For his information I wish to state that the Committee on Appropriations has very completely and thoroughly considered all these projects, which have been authorized in the past, and which have received the approval of the Budget Bureau.

I wish to inform the Senator from Illinois that the \$16,000,000 which he proposes to cut in this particular item

pertains to \$4,000,000 worth of the phase A construction in the Missouri Basin.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question, in my time?

Mr. ECTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Montana to say that we should not alter the committee's figures?

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I sometimes wonder what is the use of having committees in the Senate if every committee recommendation and every committee item is to be altered, or an attempt made on the floor of the Senate to cut it. If that course is to be followed we might as well abandon the committee system.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the Senator from Montana whether he believes that we should not alter the committee's figures? Is it his position that we should not do that?

Mr. ECTON. No—

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope not, because the Senator from Montana voted, a few moments ago, for a \$12,000,000 increase.

Mr. ECTON. For the Senator's information, I wish to remind him that I did not vote for the \$12,000,000 increase a while ago. I voted for the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I beg the Senator's pardon. I withdraw the remark.

Mr. ECTON. I hope the Senator will withdraw that statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shot at the wrong man. Please excuse me. I wish to rectify the error.

Mr. ECTON. For the information of the Senator from Illinois, I might tell him that I voted against a very major project in my own State, for the simple reason that the Budget Bureau had turned it down in the beginning, and the committee considered it and turned it down, and I was supporting the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator has stated what the Senator from Michigan had intended to say, that the Senator from Montana did actually cast his vote against a project in his own State.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I withdraw my animadversion, and apologize most profusely. But it is interesting to many persons that many Senators are never in favor of an amendment to reduce an appropriation, but are always in favor of an amendment to increase one. I am sorry that I included the Senator from Montana in an unjust criticism.

Mr. ECTON. I remind the able Senator from Illinois that this four-million-dollar reduction applies mainly to irrigation projects in my own State which have been authorized and approved by the Budget Bureau. That is what I seek to protect at this particular time by opposing the very drastic reduction proposed in the Senator's amendment.

The Senator's amendment applies to the irrigation phase of the over-all program in the Missouri River Basin. It

affects three projects in Montana. In the Crow Creek project, for instance, 5,020 acres of irrigable land are affected. Near Miles City a large acreage of irrigable land is affected, and in the Sidney Unit in eastern Montana 3,475 acres are affected. The Crow Creek project is connected with the Canyon Ferry power project in Broadwater County, Mont.

There is a special stipulation in the appropriation bill, which has been carried in appropriation bills for a long time, that before a power project can be fully utilized a certain amount of new land must be placed under irrigation to offset the good land in the valley which has been flooded by the reservoir resulting from the construction of the dam. So, Mr. President, if we cut out this irrigation project as it pertains to the Crow Creek area, we nullify practically the complete use of the dam itself. There is no use handicapping the irrigation features of these projects and not making use of the water which is being dammed up and the power which will be made available.

If the Senator from Illinois really understood the consequences that would follow the adoption of his amendment, I am confident that because of his fairness and sound judgment he would not want the amendment adopted.

Mr. President, for the reasons I have stated I sincerely hope that this particular amendment will be rejected. It is true the Senate committee increased the amount somewhat over the amount in the bill as it passed the House, but we have to go to conference and make an adjustment with the House. I think the matter can be adjusted properly in the conference.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, with reference to the pending bill, and in answer to a query raised by the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] earlier, I would say that, of course, no member of the Appropriations Committee believes that the bill is not subject to scrutiny by the Senate or subject to such amendments as the Senate itself may desire to write into it, because that is our legislative process. But I will say to the Senator from Illinois that I believe great weight should be given to the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. I am a member of that committee, and I do not know of a committee of the Senate which spends longer hours or does more work than does the Committee on Appropriations; and I have served on other committees which have been hard working.

I know of no man who gives more time as chairman of a subcommittee than does the able senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I know of no committee whose members have more objectively viewed various requests from all sections of the country.

We are dealing with what may be properly termed, in my opinion, a capital investment in the future of America. Certainly anyone who has followed the hearings before the subcommittee

this year knows that we have devoted long hours to hearing testimony from those who advocated projects and those who might be opposing projects, from Government departments dealing with the subjects, and we have delved very thoroughly into the figures.

I think I am betraying no secret from the inner sanctums of the Appropriations Committee when I say that after the subcommittee reported the pending bill to the full committee, there were very prolonged discussions in the full committee at which time members who felt that the subcommittee had not reduced certain items far enough had a full chance to express their views. The full committee, in a number of instances, after prolonged discussions and not simply perfunctory consideration, made certain changes in the report as presented by the subcommittee. Then the bill was reported to the Senate.

I say, with the greatest respect, since I have a high regard and great esteem for the Senator from Illinois, that I do not believe we can rewrite on the floor of the Senate an appropriation bill of this nature without doing much damage to a great many worthy projects. Certainly, if our country is to be faced in the future, as I think it may be, with demands for higher productivity in our factories, it is going to be necessary to increase hydroelectric power development. If in the future we are to be called upon, as we well may be, not only to feed our own growing population, but the people of other nations of the world, we are going to have a consider the bringing in of additional agricultural lands for that purpose.

We must always keep in mind, in this form of capital investment in the future of America, the fact that as we make for sound economic conditions in the various areas of our country, we are, in turn, increasing the wealth of the Nation and the tax-paying power of its people.

I am quite frank to say to the Senator from Illinois that it is possible, of course, to carry that argument to the extreme, as we can carry any other argument to the extreme, and we can spend tremendous sums in the development of reclamation. But I submit that as to the total budget now pending before the Congress, the appropriations carried in this bill amount to just about \$500,000,000 out of the President's total budget of approximately \$71,000,000,000. I hope the able Senator from Arizona will repeat today just what the percentage amounts to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. May I have one more minute?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. While I certainly would not challenge, and have never challenged, the right of the Senate to make any changes in any bill reported from a committee, I believe the Senate should give great weight to the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations,

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I rise to correct the RECORD with respect to remarks made by the Senator from Virginia regarding the amendment in the nature of a substitute which was offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] which was defeated. The Senator from Virginia said that only one witness, a man by the name of E. W. Rising, had appeared before the committee in behalf of the amendment. What the Senator from Virginia intended to say was that he was the only witness who appeared in favor of these amendments as a whole, and that Budget representatives did not appear, nor did the representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation appear. I desire to correct the RECORD to the extent of adding that other Senators did appear in behalf of specific projects, numbering seven or eight.

I make this statement with great courtesy to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, for whom I have the highest regard, who corrected me just as the time for debate on the amendment expired. I asked him if my remarks were not correct, and he said they were not correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, let me say that not only did Senators appear, but representatives from the projects which are listed, appeared before the subcommittee.

Mr. BYRD. There was no representative from any Government agency who appeared in behalf of the projects.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. But persons from the affected areas appeared.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Virginia wishes to apologize and correct the statement which he made to the extent indicated.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield for an observation?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do not believe I have the floor.

Mr. WATKINS. With respect to the Weber Basin Project in Utah, the Mayor of Ogden, Utah, and the representative of the Weber Basin Conservation District testified at length in favor of that project. The junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and I also appeared and made lengthy statements as to the project, and what the money was to be used for. I may say to the Senator from Virginia that so far as getting a budget estimate for a project is concerned, there is very little chance for a Republican from Utah to get such a budget estimate.

Mr. BYRD. Democrats are also involved in this expenditure of \$12,000,000.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand that. But I want to let the Senator from Virginia know that so far as the Senator from Utah is concerned, he presented arguments with respect to the merits of the project.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I hope to return the larger part of the 5 min-

utes to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. President, in rising in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I do so with full appreciation of the thing he seeks to do, and with full sympathy with him in his attempt actually to translate words into action, in his attempt to cease making a joke of economy, and trying to translate the talk about economy into positive action. I want to express my appreciation to him for trying to do so.

In this instance my opposition, Mr. President, rests upon what I think is a sound basis, namely that the funds here involved are not funds to begin construction of new projects or, except in a very minor degree, extending additions to existing projects. They represent in their great entirety what we might term progress payments on existing construction contracts. The majority of those contracts are stupendous in size. It requires a vast amount of equipment, material and labor to carry them forward. There is a very heavy investment made by the contractor before a single shovel of earth is turned or a wheel is turned. That initial investment is always a part of the contract bid, and must be met.

By the same token, if the contractor cannot go forward and finish the job in accordance with the contract, then he has not gotten the benefit that he expected to get out of his initial investment. That raises the question of who is to suffer the loss.

But it goes beyond that, Mr. President. Workers are brought to these construction jobs. They have changed their places of residence. They have walked away from other opportunities of employment. The whole pattern of the lives of the construction workers and their families on these projects is changed completely, in many instances irretrievably, because they must then leave one project and go to another project somewhere else, moving the family, moving the equipment, seeking new housing. All the dislocations that can come in that type of case are apparent and will be realities if we cannot maintain orderly progress of existing contract agreements.

I cannot speak for this year because I was unable to be present at the subcommittee meeting when this matter was heard—although I am sure the evidence is fully available—but in years past we have always gone into the matter project by project and determined what is being done, what contracts are outstanding, how far the contractor has gone on the job, what will be the result if he cannot maintain the progress schedule which was given him as a basis for his bid when he was awarded the contract. From the basic information gathered by the committee—although as I say, and I do not want to advance an argument that is not based upon the facts to my own knowledge, and I was not able to hear this particular testimony—I am certain from the justifications, that here again are existing contracts, with all the impedimenta, the construction contractor on the job, the workmen on the job,

the materials ordered, much of the materials on hand; and a cutting down of the progress rate in a case like that, Mr. President, unfortunately will not save money. It will not simply slow down the job, it will cost more to do the same work, even though we attempt to pick it up next year. In other words, we would be paying a dollar and a half to get a dollar's worth of economy, and that is not economy.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire about the remaining time on each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has 2 minutes, and the Senator from Illinois 14 minutes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I suggest that the Senator from Illinois use some of his time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan has indicated previously that this amendment is not an attempt to strike down and destroy reclamation.

The Senator from Michigan feels—and he has an amendment he intended to submit relating to the same committee amendment—that it is perfectly proper that we should vote on this particular amendment first. What the Senator from Illinois is trying to do is to have this particular item, and all other items considered in connection with the entire budget and in the light of necessary expenditures for the national defense. The Senator from Michigan agrees that the time has come when even reclamation, important as it is, should be considered in that light. No one is going to doubt that the reclamation projects have been good for the United States, and that some of these projects should be completed, and will be completed. This is not an attempt to destroy them at all. It is an attempt to try to use the money the United States receives in taxes from its people for this year with due regard to the Government's necessities.

I know how some of the States are affected. I know that water becomes very political in certain States. There is no more political subject than water. One of the reasons why it is so political is that it is vital to the needs of the people. Without water there is desert, and there is no place for politicians to thrive. There is no constituency to be represented.

Mr. President, I am sure that this amendment would not destroy reclamation. It would slow it down somewhat. The House, in its wisdom, cut this appropriation to \$197,000,000. The Senate committee raised it to \$208,344,450. That indicates that it is the judgment of the House that this item can be cut without destroying reclamation.

So far as the Senate Committee on Appropriations is concerned, I agree with the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. It is a hard-working committee. I am a member of that committee. I know something about the amount of work we are required to do.

At times we have as many as three subcommittee meetings at one time, and Senators must read the record to know what is going on in the committee. At 1 o'clock today, while members of the Appropriations Committee were engaged in the consideration of this vital bill, the Senate and House conferees were trying to hold a conference on the independent offices bill.

When an appropriation bill comes to the floor each Senator is responsible to his constituents back home, as well as to all the people of the United States. We should look at this question in the light of the economy of the United States. We have a defense program in excess of \$60,000,000,000. When I refer to the defense program, I am not losing sight of the fact that some of the items in this bill could be considered as indirect defense items. However, I am speaking primarily about direct defense items, items which are to be used by our soldiers directly upon the enemy. From the standpoint of defense, reclamation is, of course, an indirect item of defense. When we are asked for \$60,000,000,000 plus for defense, I say that in all fairness to the people of the United States who are to pay the taxes, we should consider these appropriations from the standpoint of the economy of the entire country.

An increase of 12½ percent in taxes is asked. Last year's tax bill was not put into effect over the entire year. However, there is an increase over last year of 10 percent. The taxpayer is going to find that he will have an increase of 22½ percent for the current year if the full \$7,500,000,000 is voted.

I hope the Senate will adopt this amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Michigan in urging the Senate to adopt this amendment. I point out that even though this amendment were adopted, it would still leave twice as much money appropriated for this Department of the Government as was appropriated in any year prior to 1946.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a list of the appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the past 10 years.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

<i>Appropriations for Department of the Interior</i>	
1941-----	\$169, 537, 000
1942-----	280, 490, 000
1943-----	281, 006, 000
1944-----	235, 424, 000
1945-----	214, 338, 000
1946-----	248, 817, 000
1947-----	290, 408, 000
1948-----	320, 603, 000
1949-----	516, 401, 000
1950-----	578, 687, 000
1951-----	520, 082, 000

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that these appropriations have increased from \$169,000,000 in 1941, to \$248,000,000 in 1946, and

\$520,000,000 in 1951. Even if we adopt this cut, it will still leave twice as much as the Department had in any year prior to 1946. It has been only in the past 2 or 3 years that the appropriations have exceeded \$500,000,000.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not have the time. I am sorry.

The very least we can do, if we mean what we say in the economy drive, is to vote for this cut. It has been pointed out on the floor of the Senate that perhaps Senators who are for reclamation projects should not vote for this cut. Also it has been called to the attention of the Senator from Illinois that both political platforms have endorsed reclamation projects. I point out that both political platforms for the past 20 years have been promising the American people a balanced budget and a reduction in expenditures. I think the time has come to carry out that part of the program, particularly when we are considering a tax increase of about \$10,000,000,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is highly important that we consider not merely individual items as they come up, but rather these individual items in relationship to the total budget picture. If we merely consider individual items by themselves, we shall always be attracted by the merits of the individual proposals, and we can find merits in virtually every proposal that comes before us. Therefore, we go along from one item to another, and from one bill to another, constantly voting for large appropriations, with the result that if we do not consider the total picture we wind up with huge appropriations and a large deficit. So it is necessary constantly to bear in mind what we are shooting at.

I submit that with a \$12,000,000,000 deficit facing us, we must consider both the individual appropriation bills and the general tax bill together, and that at the very minimum we must save \$5,000,000,000 on the appropriations, of which not far from \$2,000,000,000 must come from the domestic, nondefense items, which will mean an average cut of not far from 20 percent.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not have much time. I should prefer to continue, if I may.

The cut proposed by the committee is 8 percent. I submit, therefore, that we should make a larger cut in order to get ready to help make the total reduction of \$2,000,000,000.

I am not proposing to make an across-the-board cut by this amendment. It is confined to five projects. It is true that they are five important projects. In the case of the All-American Canal, it was not recommended by the Budget Bureau. It was put in by the House and Senate, and I am proposing to return to the budget figure of only \$180,000 for minor improvements, instead of the figure of

close to \$3,000,000, which the Senate committee put in.

With respect to four projects—two of them in California, one in Washington, and the Missouri River Basin project—I am proposing a 10-percent slow-down in the rate of construction. If we can reduce governmental expenditures by 10 percent—and I believe we can—why can we not reduced the contractors' rate of expenditure by 10 percent? The rate of labor turn-over on construction projects is probably the highest in the country. The contractors can adjust very readily by not filling vacancies caused by workers who leave the construction camps. They can cut their expenditures by 10 percent, and slow down their rate, without dislocation. But if they continue to spend at the rate contemplated by the Committee they will be drawing labor and materials away from national defense. They will actually be reducing the defense capacity of the country.

So this 10 percent slowdown in the rate of construction of irrigation projects—and I want to point out that it is irrigation that I am proposing to cut, and not power—can be effected without reducing national production at all. On the contrary, it would enable production to take place in areas where it is needed.

I am also proposing a further saving of \$3,000,000, in the planning of further reclamation projects in the Missouri Basin. I would cut the planning outlays in half. I have pointed out that we already have between \$3,000,000,000 and \$4,000,000,000 worth of projects already authorized, for which plans have been drawn. What I am trying to reduce is the drawing of further plans, in addition to the plans for the \$3,000,000,000 or \$4,000,000,000 worth of projects, so that we will not have a heaping up of additional plans to be acted upon in the future.

Certainly this is an economy which can be made with profit at this time. Let the draftsmen and civil engineers go into the Army and draw military plans, or let them go into industries which are producing war goods, and draw plans for tanks, guns, and airplanes, instead of for additional billions of dollars' worth of irrigation projects not yet authorized by Congress. It would be merely building up a backlog upon which we would be asked to vote in the future.

Mr. President, the time is now, the chance to save is here, and I hope very much that we may save the \$16,000,000 for the taxpayers.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not certain how much time I have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Virginia for a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. On page 7901 of Friday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD there appears a list of the projects which the Senator believes should be cut.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The second project listed is the Cachuma project, in California.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I understand that a cut in that particular project would be very injurious to the status of the work already done, and could involve us in a greater eventual loss than a saving.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would be only a 10-percent slowdown. It would be a reduction. It calls for a reduction of only \$1,000,000. How could such a reduction seriously threaten the project?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] to explain what the effect of such a cut would be. I have voted for some cuts on some projects. I shall be very glad to support further cuts, as proposed by the Senator from Illinois, but I am disturbed about this proposed cut. Will the Senator from Illinois yield so that the Senator from Oregon may explain the situation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have no time remaining to yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to point out that for construction and rehabilitation, which includes the construction work of the Bureau of Reclamation, the 1952 budget estimate was \$224,090,000. The House allowed an appropriation of \$197,000,000. The Senate committee recommended \$208,000,000, which is \$65,000,000 less than was appropriated for the last fiscal year. In other words, there would be a cut in this year's work, as compared with last year's work, of \$35,000,000. It is \$15,000,000 less than the 1952 budget submitted by the President. It is a cut of \$15,000,000 in the budget. Therefore substantial reductions have already been made, and for that reason any further reductions should not be made and would not be justified.

It is proposed that \$16,000,000 be "saved" by slowing down construction on some of the irrigation projects and making substantial reductions in planning funds. Any slowing down of going construction work is an extremely costly operation for the Government. Where contracts are already awarded, the slowing down of work is not practicable without the payment of large sums as damages to the contractors for work deferred or postponed. All construction work for the Bureau is scheduled on a completely integrated basis so that projects are brought into service feature by feature at specific times. Deferment or slow-down destroys the integration, forces an extension of the period of construction with resultant increase of overhead costs. In a period of rising prices the increase in cost of completion of projects will be substantial. Based on the experience during World War II, when construction of a number of irrigation projects was suspended, the final completion cost will be at least twice that of the cost estimated prior to the

war, due to the change in price levels alone.

The expanding population of the West, which percentagewise is greater than the rest of the country, has placed a heavy drain on the sources of food and other agricultural products produced on the western irrigated areas. A continuing program of irrigation should be continued parallel to the population growth of the region. The majority of the funds to be appropriated for irrigation purposes are for construction of canals and other facilities that deliver water from existing reservoirs. By that means water and land will be put to productive use for needed agricultural crops. Also by that means water users will begin repayment at an earlier date, and the Government's investment in its dams and reservoirs will not be sterilized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired. All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	McKellar
Anderson	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bennett	Hennings	Monroney
Bricker	Hill	Moody
Bridges	Hoey	Morse
Butler, Md.	Holland	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Neely
Byrd	Hunt	Nixon
Cain	Ives	O'Connor
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Clements	Kem	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kilgore	Stennis
Douglas	Knowland	Taft
Duff	Langer	Thye
Dworshak	Lehman	Underwood
Eastland	Lodge	Watkins
Ecton	Long	Welker
Ellender	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	Williams
Frear	McCarthy	Young
Fulbright	McClellan	
George	McFarland	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "(B)" of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment, as amended, on page 18, in line 21.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this question.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official committee business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has a general pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation.

On this vote, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea" and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 57, as follows:

YEAS—19

Bricker	George	Pastore
Bridges	Hendrickson	Robertson
Byrd	Hoey	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Ives	Underwood
Douglas	Lodge	Williams
Ferguson	Moody	
Frear	O'Connor	

NAYS—57

Aiken	Hennings	McClellan
Anderson	Hill	McFarland
Bennett	Holland	McKellar
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Millikin
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Monroney
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Mundt
Carlson	Johnson, S. C.	Neely
Case	Kefauver	Nixon
Chavez	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Clements	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Cordon	Knowland	Schoeppel
Duff	Long	Stennis
Dworshak	Lehman	Taft
Eastland	Long	Thye
Eaton	Magnuson	Watkins
Ellender	Maybank	Welker
Fulbright	McCarthy	Wherry
Sayden		Young

NOT VOTING—20

Benton	Jenner	Smathers
Brewster	Malone	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Martin	Smith, N. C.
Flanders	McCarran	Sparkman
Gillette	McMahon	Tobey
Green	Murray	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Russell	

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment to the committee amendment, as amended, was rejected.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I call up the amendment designated as "7-9-51-E," which is offered by me on behalf of myself, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the Senator's amendment is not now in order.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, to the committee amendment, as amended, on page 18, in line 21, I offer my amendment identified as "7-6-51-L," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment, as amended, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, as amended, on page 18, in line 21, it is proposed to strike out "\$208,535,450" and insert "\$198,000,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the \$208,535,450 item is the largest single appropriation in the bill; it is well over 40 percent of the total amount of money carried in the bill. The basis of this amendment is a 5 percent reduction in the program as recommended by the committee. It should be noted that the reduction proposed by the amendment would still leave the figure exactly 1,000,000 more than the amount voted by the House. Five percent of the committee's recommendation is \$10,417,222, to be subtracted from the committee's recommendation, which would provide \$197,927,228. Rounding that figure off to \$198,000,000, it allows \$72,712 more than the 5 percent would deduct. I am completely satisfied that a 5 percent cut-back in this construction program can be accomplished without doing damage to any long-range program. Moreover, I am absolutely convinced that such cut-backs are essential in this time of emergency.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Michigan says he is convinced that the proposed cut would not have any effect upon the long-range program. I inquire where the Senator obtains that information. What testimony by any witness convinces him of that fact? I have read the testimony.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have read it, too, and I am well aware of the fact that the Director of the Budget, in the figures on the projects indicated on pages 15 and 16 of the report, spelled out certain amounts for the budget this year. Those amounts were spelled out as early as last August, when an emergency had not yet been declared, when the country had not gone all out in the matter of preparedness as it has today. I do not mean total preparedness, but I mean

preparedness to the extent of \$60,650,000,000.

When the Senate Appropriations Committee considered those items, it will be noted, by reference to page 15 of the report, that in the very great majority of cases they recommended the amount of the budget estimate, and in several cases even more. On the third item from the top, the budget estimate was \$180,000; the House allowed \$1,772,330; and the committee gave \$2,963,000.

From page 16 of the report it will be noted that, on the first item, the budget estimate was \$100,000; the amount allowed by the House was \$95,080; and the amount provided by the Senate committee was \$200,000. Then, dropping to the eighth item, the budget estimate was \$1,088,000; the House allowed \$1,224,660; and the Senate committee recommended \$1,288,000. That is why the Senator from Michigan feels that, if the amounts were reduced only to the extent of 5 percent, it could hardly slow down the program to any extent in the long haul, and the Senator from Michigan would feel that, in applying this 5 percent cut, if the sum of an individual reduction would make possible the completion of a project, he would naturally expect that the project would be completed by minor adjustments from other project funds, under this amendment. When I refer to a 5-percent cut across the board, if the funds represented by 5 percent would complete the job on an individual project, the Senator from Michigan would expect that the job would be completed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have no objection to the Senator's convictions in respect to this matter.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan is merely expressing his own convictions about it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. However, I have yet to find in the record of the hearings the testimony of any responsible witness who knows anything about these projects, who has said that a 5-percent cut could be taken without slowing down a project. It may be the conviction of the Senator from Michigan that that is possible.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is all I am contending.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We had a vote a short time ago, I may say to the Senator from Michigan, on the Douglas amendment, concerning a project about which I happen to know something; the appropriation for which it is proposed to cut \$2,200,000 plus.

The project is about 80 percent completed. It would mean that we would have to pay the contractors to remove their equipment, and, next year, move it onto the job again. It would cost probably \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator say it would be necessary to remove the machinery if merely a 5-percent cut were made in the item?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have seen a cut of \$2,000,000 in a \$30,000,000 project which made it impossible for the contractor to complete the job, and it was nec-

essary for him to move out. What is the economy? These are all reimbursable items. I do not see the economy in this proposal. I appreciate the Senator's conviction, and I have no objection to them, but if the Senator from Michigan can show me any place in the testimony where it is said that a cut of 5 percent, or any other cut, would not slow up the projects in the long run, and would make for economy, I shall be glad to support his amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. The committee, instead of allowing the budget estimate of \$224,090,000, cut the budget to \$208,344,450.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That action was based upon testimony which showed that the projects could be completed for that amount.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; but let us see what the testimony is in regard to cases of this kind. We hear talk about slowing down the projects. The people of the United States, outside the Bureau of Reclamation, cannot possibly hire engineers to determine whether a cut of a certain amount in these projects this year would destroy them. It would cost thousands of dollars to hire such engineers for that purpose. When we read the testimony, we are reading the testimony of witnesses who went before the Bureau of the Budget with estimates even greater than the \$224,090,000. We are taking the testimony of men who have already said that the work cannot possibly be done for less than \$224,090,000. The only safe thing for us to do is to approve an amount which we honestly believe will not be destructive of a project.

A majority of Senators felt that the cut proposed by the Senator from Illinois was too severe, and, therefore, following the dictates of their own consciences, they voted against it. The Senator from Michigan now proposes an amendment which would not make so deep a cut, but which would make a 5-percent cut, except in those cases where such an amount would make possible the completion of the job; and, since the appropriations for some of these items have been increased above the budget estimate, there will be sufficient money with which to complete the small number of projects without the expenditure of extra money.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I desire to pose a question to the Senator, and I pose it very seriously. These projects are going to cost a certain amount of money. They are projects which have been authorized and for which appropriations have been made. Many of them have been partially completed. The quicker we get them finished, the quicker the reimbursable provisions will take effect, and repayment will begin. What economy is there in impeding the progress of construction on these projects, instead of getting the jobs finished? I cannot understand how economy could follow.

Mr. FERGUSON. The economy is reflected by what the committee did. If the Senator's argument is sound, then he should be seeking to increase the appropriations.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I make no argument, I merely pose a question seriously. The projects will cost so much money. We know many of them are going to be completed. The quicker a project is completed, the quicker the repayments will begin, the quicker the Government will be reimbursed for its expenditures. What is the economy in slowing down the progress of construction? The only result would be to retard progress.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

The committee thought it should cut down the amount this year; the budget director asked for \$224,000,000, and the committee recommended only \$208,000,000. If the contention is that that is not economy, then we should not vote for that cut; a motion should be made to increase the sum to \$224,000,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know what the testimony is, but I know that the more quickly a reclamation job which has been started is completed, the more quickly it pays back to the Government, and it does not cost any more. I do not see any economy in stopping progress; in fact, I see the reverse.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sure the Senator from Michigan does not want to make any misrepresentations.

Mr. FERGUSON. Not at all.

Mr. HAYDEN. If he will look at page 16 of the report, he will see, with reference to the Buffalo Rapids project, that the amount of the budget estimate was \$100,000. The amount allowed by the House was \$95,080, and the amount recommended by the Senate committee was \$200,000. The Senator implied that that amount was above the amount recommended by the budget. Look at the note with reference to that item:

Subsequent to release of the 1952 President's budget, the Budget Bureau revised these estimates to provide \$100,000 additional funds for Buffalo Rapids, first division, under "Construction" rather than under "Rehabilitation and betterment," because of conflict with repayment arrangements.

Again, in connection with the New Mexico-Texas-Rio Grande project, the Budget estimate was \$1,088,000. The note with reference to that item reads as follows:

Subsequent to release of the 1952 President's budget, the Budget Bureau approved an increase of \$200,000 for the Rio Grande project to \$1,288,000, which resulted from contract bids higher than anticipated.

That is covered by the budget estimate.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan stands corrected. The footnote shows that there is a correction. I was looking at the original budget estimate, and I did not know of the supplementals. Are they in the record?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; the items are covered by budget estimates.

Mr. FERGUSON. So the two items on page 16 are equal to the revised budget estimate.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad the Senator has corrected me.

Mr. President, that clearly demonstrates that even the Budget Director from time to time varies the figures. In the first case he asked for an additional \$100,000, and in the other case he asked for an increase of \$200,000. So these amounts are not stationary. If the Senator from Washington is correct in his argument, the United States Government, in its rearmament program, should spend every dollar this year. We should pay no fixed amount, because next year we are going to need more, and because we will need it next year there is no reason why the taxpayers should be compelled to pay it this year. That is like saying that because a thing must sometime be acquired, we have to acquire it this year.

I noted the statement of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] on the floor last week, and I saw it later in the press, that we are going to have to cut the budget approximately \$6,000,000,000, and if we do not, we shall find ourselves in economic difficulty. There is nothing that would satisfy Joe Stalin better than would an economic collapse in the United States of America. We, as Senators of the United States, who were sent here to represent our sovereign States, must consider these figures, and we must think about economy.

I am glad the distinguished Senator from Georgia is holding hearings on the tax bill. I hope the bill will not be reported until after all the appropriation bills are settled, so that we may see how much we shall need to balance the budget, because, for the safety of America, I think we shall need to stay within the Government's income. For every dollar we cut from this bill, the Senator from Georgia will be required to raise that much less in taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my next remarks be placed at the point in the RECORD where I had been previously speaking. Because of the time limitation, I was required to lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan thinks it should be pointed out that although this item purports to be some \$15,000,000 below the budget estimate, actually many of the projects which have been approved will enjoy the full budget estimate or even more. This is so because the committee has specifically denied certain lines and other features without eliminating the money for them, so that the net result

is the budget estimate or more for the projects which remain.

When we remember that this body has gone on record by overwhelming majorities for a 10-percent reduction of budget estimates on personal services, this 5-percent cut-back on construction, which eats up so much of the materials which are so critical to the Nation's economy, can be considered only a moderate request, and entirely consistent with the Senate's position on economy through reduction of personal services.

In reply to the statement of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] that these contracts were let and are, therefore, inviolate, that cannot possibly be the whole fact, because the Appropriations Committee allowed only \$208,000,000 to take care of a budget request of \$224,000,000. Apparently these contracts are subject to variation as the Budget Director requests appropriations for them from year to year, rather than being absolutely binding in advance.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Michigan has mentioned the item on page 15 dealing with the All-American Canal, I will say to the Senator that there was a contract which had existed for a good many years between the Coachella District and the Federal Government. It was a different type of contract than that which is now in vogue. The contract which the Federal Government entered into with the Coachella Valley irrigation district provided that the project, as outlined in the contract as shown by the diagram charts, will be completed in toto for a fixed figure. The Federal Government has attempted to renege on the contract. The Coachella District feels it had every reason to be able to put full faith and confidence in a contract with the Federal Government. The question is now in an impasse.

The committee decided that the only way the matter could be settled was to complete the contract as required and let the district go into court in order to sue the Government and get a judicial determination as to whether the contract which it had and which it felt was valid was actually valid. If the court determines it is not a valid contract, even though the district put full faith and credit in it, the district will be required to pay back this additional amount. It was a way out of an unusual situation. I doubt if there are many such contracts entered into. That was the only way the subcommittee and the full committee felt the question could be settled.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is taken care of by an amendment on page 26 of the bill, which provides, in lines 13 and 14, that any sums "shall be repayable by said district to the United States unless said district shall be judicially determined to be not liable therefor."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I was only making an explanation of why this additional sum appears.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan said he had no objection, and

thought that where the Government could complete a project, it should go ahead.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I received a letter from the Department of the Interior dated December 19, 1950, which presents a tabulation dealing with the very point raised by the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MACNUSON], namely, the question of the cost of these projects once they are postponed, and how much economy is involved in putting them off for a few years.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD the letter and the tabulation to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the letter and the tabulation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., December 19, 1950.
Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: The attached tabulation was prepared in response to your request for data illustrating the increases in the total estimated cost of Bureau of Reclamation projects which occurred during and subsequent to the last World War. Since 1941 all Bureau projects have been subject to increases in construction costs resulting from increases in cost of materials and labor, unforeseen conditions necessitating changes in location of major structures, or other changes in design, and desirable additions to or extensions of features not included in the 1941 estimate.

The attached tabulation lists all Bureau of Reclamation projects included in the justification for appropriations as submitted to the Congress for fiscal year 1942 and shows the total estimated cost as of 1941 and the current estimate (1951) of total project cost. It will be noted that the present estimate of the cost of the listed projects is \$2,380,968,975 and that this amount is \$1,074,917,975, or 82.3 percent greater than the 1941 total. On many projects a considerable portion of the total estimated cost as of 1941 had been expended by that time, and this portion would not, of course, be affected by subsequent price increases. A portion of this increase is attributable to improved design and the addition of desirable features, but it is estimated that the major part results from increases in the cost of materials and labor during the period 1941-51. This is supported by the Bureau's construction cost index which has increased from a base of 1.10 at the beginning of 1941 to approximately 1.60 during the period when wartime controls were in force. Since that time the index has risen to approximately 2.10. Further evidence of this trend is furnished by a recent analysis of the increases in total estimated cost of the Boise-Payette project, Anderson Ranch Dam. In 1941 the total estimated cost of the Anderson Ranch Dam was estimated to be \$13,040,000, with completion scheduled for 1946.

Subsequent changes in design as well as unforeseen costs resulting from a complete shut-down in 1947, due to a lack of funds, materially altered this estimate, and on the basis of the present plans and 1941 construction prices, the total estimated cost would have been about \$16,623,000. The increase from this amount to the present total cost of \$30,714,100 is attributable to the increased cost of labor and materials brought about by war conditions during this period. Com-

pletion date of the work was extended until 1951 because of delays primarily attributable to the war. It is believed that had construction operations been allowed to proceed with sufficient priorities to maintain a normal program, the work would have been completed under an index averaging approximately 1.35. This procedure would have resulted in a saving of some \$3,400,000 on the Anderson Ranch Dam project alone. Equivalent savings would have been experienced on all other projects which were delayed by the same conditions.

From this evidence, it can be safely assumed that in the event of another national emergency the pattern of cost increases will parallel that during the last war. On this basis if the construction of the Vermejo project or the Middle Rio Grande is to be initiated at this time and completed under emergency controls, it is believed that the total project costs, presently estimated to be \$2,679,000 and \$30,179,000, respectively, would be increased by about 30 percent. However, if construction of these projects is deferred for several years, it can be expected that the total estimated cost will increase approximately 100 percent over present estimates. Such increases might seriously jeopardize the feasibility of the project unless there are comparable increases in the long-term benefits.

It should be noted that in addition to the large increases in total estimated costs that would result from a deferral of construction during an extended national emergency, such a deferral would also result in very substantial losses to the Nation in the way of benefits from low-cost hydroelectric power and the agricultural products of the potential irrigable acreage involved. During the last world war, stoppages and delays in the construction of certain features of the Central Valley project resulted in a loss of about \$5,610,000 in net power revenues alone. The deferral of construction of Davis Dam for about 3.4 years also resulted in a loss of about \$10,000,000 in power revenues from that project.

I am more than pleased to be able to furnish the preceding information. If I can be of any further service in connection with this problem, please feel free to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

G. W. LINEWEAVER,
Acting Commissioner.

Bureau of Reclamation—Comparison of total estimated cost as of 1941 and current estimate of total cost

Project	1941 total estimated cost	Present total estimated cost
Davis Dam.....	\$41,200,000	\$114,438,000
Gila.....	20,500,000	53,968,541
Parker Dam power.....	16,625,000	23,718,659
Central Valley.....	264,990,000	599,583,600
Colorado-Big Thompson.....	54,918,000	150,165,000
San Luis.....	17,887,000	45,146,000
Boise-Anderson Ranch.....	13,040,000	30,714,100
Tuacarni.....	8,155,000	16,731,500
W. C. Austin (Lugert-Altus).....	5,600,000	13,296,000
Colorado River, Tex.....	23,595,000	23,961,734
Provo River.....	16,202,000	30,960,000
Yakima-Roza.....	18,085,000	22,838,000
Valley Gravity.....	65,200,000	126,552,000
Fort Peck.....	6,839,000	14,820,000
Boulder Canyon.....	143,000,000	173,900,000
Boise-Payette.....	8,888,000	17,173,000
Deschutes, north unit.....	8,400,000	12,850,000
Kendrick.....	20,000,000	32,262,000
Klamath.....	884,000	13,327,651
Owyhee.....	18,700,000	18,837,476
Riverton.....	9,466,000	24,215,000
Shoshone.....	6,500,000	16,831,547
Sun River.....	9,500,000	9,597,449
All-American Canal system.....	65,000,000	67,647,073
Paonia.....	1,203,000	6,432,700
Grand Coulee Dam.....	435,734,000	715,100,000
Hyrum.....	940,000	941,885
Total.....	1,306,051,000	2,380,968,975

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I point particularly to the fact that a number of projects were stopped in 1941 because of the war situation. The Department has listed the total estimated cost at that time, which was \$1,306,051,000. The present total estimated cost to complete these same projects is \$2,380,968,975.

Reference was made a few days ago to the Davis Dam project which could have been completed at a fixed cost of \$41,200,000, but, because of the fact that we were in an all-out war, it was postponed. Now the cost is estimated at \$114,438,000. If that were the only instance, we might say it was justified by the circumstances, but such postponement stops the development of power coming from these projects. The Department of the Interior has officially estimated that the deferral of the construction of the Davis Dam for 3.4 years resulted in a loss of approximately \$10,000,000 in power revenues from that one project alone.

This story that it helps industry to cripple the industrious is not so new as it seems. Aesop knew about it when he wrote the fable of the goose that laid the golden egg. These reclamation projects have been a benefit to the country. It is absurd to say that spending money for a reclamation project is increasing our deficits and increasing our expenses. From a bookkeeping standpoint, that might be true, but I recognize that there are corporations now engaged in making capital expenditures on long-time investments. They do not carry such capital expenditures as current expenses. I read a short time ago that the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. was planning a substantial improvement. It will not put the cost of that improvement in its budget as current expense. And when the United States Government builds a Davis Dam or a Grand Coulee Dam, or a Hungry Horse Dam, or some other of these great projects, and carries it in a current appropriation bill, it is not an expense any more than such an improvement as I have cited has been expense to the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

The one thing I have regretted is that when REA appropriations and power-line appropriations are made by the United States Government, they are set up as annual expenditures, but when similar outlays are made by private power companies they are set up as long-term investments which may be amortized over the passing of years. If a railroad company in a particular area lays down some new track it is a long-time investment, but if the Government of the United States improves a railroad in Alaska it is a current expenditure, and comes out of that year's budget. I think it is long overdue that the Government of the United States did its auditing on the same basis employed by ordinary private business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to say just a few words. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], has sounded what I believe to be the keynote. The appropriations for the projects under discussion are productive expenditures. They are productive in revenue to the Government, direct and indirect revenue, for the repayment of what the projects cost, and productive in revenue from new businesses, new industries, new employment, created as a result of these expenditures.

The time is here, Mr. President, when the people of the United States, under the leadership of the Congress, have to decide whether we are going to be builders or destroyers. There are pending before us appropriations for the armed services, for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, amounting to \$60,650,000,000. These appropriations probably can be cut. As chairman of the subcommittee having charge of the scrutiny of the appropriations, I hope that it will be possible to cut them. But this I know, that it will be very much more simple to save \$10,000,000 by the reduction of an appropriation for one or two vessels, or aircraft, or guns, than it will be by the reduction of a productive expenditure such as we make under an appropriation in the pending bill for the Reclamation Service.

The Bureau of the Budget, under the direction of the President, has followed what seems to me to be a completely sensible and logical standard in submitting the estimates for the Bureau of Reclamation. The principle has been that no recommendation would be made for new projects; that recommendations would be made only for the completion of existing projects; and an examination of existing projects will speedily demonstrate that the longer the construction is dragged out, the more costly it is bound to be. If we were to cut off the appropriations for these projects we would injure the economy rather than improve it, because we would be laying the foundation for damage suits against the Government of the United States from contractors who have obligations to fill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The reduction proposed by the amendment is directed at projects under construction.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Therefore it will simply result in a delay in completion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That will be the only result?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That will be the only result. That is true.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And it will not result in the saving of a dollar to the Government? It would simply result in a prolongation of the expenditure?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, and a delay of the return in the repayments to the Government.

Collections from reclamation funds in 1950 amounted to \$41,105,000. Collections in 1952 are estimated to amount to \$61,931,000. The sales of power run

from something like \$1,750,000, in the case of the Fort Peck Reservoir, to \$32,500,000, in the case of Bonneville.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to have 1 minute of time to ask a question of the Senator from Wyoming, if the Senator from Arizona will grant me the time.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. My question is this: Not only does the amount of money recommended for appropriation cover the expense of a project which is underway, but the contracts have been let.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The contractors are on the ground, the contractors have their machinery there, the contractors have made all their plans for finishing the project, and if any interruption in the funds comes about at this time by the proposed arbitrary reduction in the appropriation, there will be a great loss resulting to the country and the Government, will there not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no hesitation in saying that there is no economy in reducing an appropriation of this kind. It will be observed that on the next page of the bill the committee adopted two amendments, which I offered, forbidding the construction of two new projects.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield, with the consent of the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield more time?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as the Senator from Wyoming knows, I was absent from the Senate Chamber when the matter under consideration was being discussed. I am a member of the committee. Was this subject matter brought up in the committee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. What did the committee do?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The committee voted against the reduction which the Senator from Michigan now desires to achieve.

FLOOD CONDITIONS IN MISSOURI

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Missouri has asked me to yield some time to him.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I wish to make a short statement regarding flood conditions now existing in the State of Missouri.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without regard to the time allotted to either side, the Senator from Missouri be permitted not to exceed 5 minutes to make a statement regarding flood conditions in Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, that is what I meant to ask.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senator from Missouri is aware of the fact that those flood conditions can be corrected by the completion of the dams on the Missouri River and its tributaries, items for which are carried in the pending appropriation bill, is he not? The appropriations pending contemplate the construction of reservoirs to stop the water where the flood plain is not so narrow, and where the banks are high enough to store the water so it will not get down into the State of Missouri. If we slow down the rate of construction, we postpone the date of effective flood control.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, that is a very intricate question, of course, and I think we will have to postpone the discussion of it to some later time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, we are now experiencing in the State of Missouri, along the Missouri River, the most serious flood in 48 years, that is, since the memorable flood of 1903. Thousands of fertile acres are under water, and some populous districts are gravely threatened.

I am told by Col. Craig Smyser, executive to the Chief of Army Engineers, that the engineers have \$5,500,000 available for emergency flood control work, from appropriations previously made by Congress.

I have urged Colonel Smyser to look into the situation on the Missouri and to take appropriation action.

There is now pending before Congress an \$8,500,000,000 foreign aid bill for next year. The Missouri taxpayers' share of this huge sum is \$217,600,000.

I have consistently taken the position that we should look after the needs of our own people instead of pouring lavish gifts of dollars down foreign rat-holes.

Under the Marshall plan, hundreds of millions of American dollars have been used to control floods and to reclaim land in foreign countries. Our taxpayers' dollars have even been used to help drain the Zuider Zee in Holland.

Residents of Holt County, Mo., just north of St. Joseph, have written me a number of times about the need for pumps to drain off the water which accumulates behind levees built in their area under the Pick-Sloan plan. So far the Army engineers have not allocated the necessary funds.

If the people of Holt County lived in Thailand, it is quite likely they would be able to obtain the pumps from the Economic Cooperation Administration. The ECA recently announced that 30 American diesel-powered pumping units are being rushed to Thailand under a \$915,000 aid project. ECA is also providing dragline excavators and heavy duty tractors costing \$515,000 so that the Government of Thailand can carry out flood prevention projects.

For my part, I think it would be wiser if this money were used to prevent floods

along American rivers, to protect American homes, and to save American lives.

I hope that the Missouri River situation will be put under immediate intensive study by the Senate Committee on Public Works and the Army Engineers, and by all the members of Congress in the area affected.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield if I have any additional time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. HENNINGS in the chair). The Senator from Missouri has 1 minute left.

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I am wondering if the distinguished Senator from Missouri knows that my State of Kansas is suffering one of the most devastating floods in its history. It will go far beyond the flood of 1903, not only on the Kaw, but on the Saline, the Solomon, the Marais des Cygnes, the Neosho, and the Verdigris. Much of the water which comes down the Kaw River will hit the Senator's town of Kansas City, Mo., of which Kansas City, Kans., is a part.

Mr. KEM. Most of the rivers which the Senator has mentioned are tributaries of the Missouri. They are pouring an enormous quantity of water into the Missouri River, threatening our lands and our cities.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I share the views of the Senator from Missouri. Certainly a very definite study should be made, and something positive should be done to prevent these terrible floods within our own States and elsewhere in the United States.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the committee amendment on page 18, line 21, as amended.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to this amendment which, as I read and understand it, is but a slight variation of the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. If I may use the terms, one was an approach with a meat ax, and the other an approach with a cleaver. One represented a cut of \$16,000,000 and the other a cut of between \$10,000,000 and \$12,000,000, directed specifically to places where discretion might be used in reduction, that is, either in the beginning of a new project or the beginning of a new segment of an old project. If that sort of reduction were now to be made on the floor of the Senate, there would be unlimited authority to spend the money wherever the Department might wish, in the entire field.

The committee has identified the projects and the amounts of money which

should be spent on each of them. That is outlined in the report. It is not a legal and binding obligation, but in the past such recommendations have been followed almost uniformly. There have been some exceptions, and the committee has taken note of them. I am inclined to believe that some of them, at least, will not be repeated.

In this instance I cannot agree that all the work which has been put into this kind of an investigation should be tossed into the ashcan, as it would have to be if this sort of reduction were made. Were the reduction tied to specific testimony as to specific projects, so that we might feel that there was considered action on our part based upon evidence in the record, I could look at the proposal with much greater favor. I should like to see some further over-all cuts made here and there. I have tried to assist in making them as we have gone along. However, I cannot see this one in this picture. I think it is the wrong approach.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. FERGUSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	McFarland
Anderson	Hendrickson	McKellar
Bennett	Hennings	Millikin
Bricker	Hill	Monroney
Bridges	Hoey	Moody
Butler, Md.	Holland	Morse
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Mundt
Byrd	Hunt	Neely
Cain	Ives	Nixon
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	O'Connor
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Chavez	Kefauver	Robertson
Clements	Kerr	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Langer	Stennis
Dworshak	Lehman	Taft
Eastland	Lodge	Thye
Eaton	Long	Watkins
Ellender	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	Williams
Frear	McCarthy	Young
Fulbright	McClellan	
George		

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENNINGS in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the committee amendment on page 18, line 21, as amended.

Mr. FERGUSON and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island

[Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official committee business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations has a general pair on this vote with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON]. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea" and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey

would vote "yea," and the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—26

Alken	George	Pastore
Bricker	Hendrickson	Robertson
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Butler, Md.	Holland	Schoeppel
Byrd	Ives	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Lodge	Taft
Douglas	McCarthy	Wherry
Ferguson	Moody	Williams
Frear	O'Connor	

NAYS—47

Anderson	Hennings	Maybank
Bennett	Hill	McClellan
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	McFarland
Cain	Hunt	McKellar
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Millikin
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Monroney
Case	Johnson, S. C.	Morse
Chavez	Kefauver	Mundt
Clements	Kem	Neely
Cordon	Kerr	Nixon
Dworshak	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Knowland	Stennis
Ecton	Langer	Thye
Ellender	Lehman	Watkins
Fulbright	Long	Young
Hayden	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—23

Benton	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Brewster	Malone	Smith, N. C.
Connally	Martin	Sparkman
Duff	McCarran	Tobey
Flanders	McMahon	Underwood
Gillette	Murray	Welker
Green	Russell	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Smathers	

So Mr. FERGUSON's amendment to the committee amendment, as amended, was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, to the committee amendment as amended, I submit an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota to the committee amendment as amended will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment as amended, on page 18, in line 21, after the figure "\$208,353,450", it is proposed to add the following: "which shall include and provide for the construction of transmission lines in the Bureau of Reclamation regions 6 and 7 including western Minnesota, and."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment, to the committee amendment, as amended, is to initiate the construction of Bureau of Reclamation transmission lines in western Minnesota and northwestern Iowa, as proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation in its plans which have been presented to the House Appropriations Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee by the Department of the Interior.

In order to provide funds for the fiscal year 1952, to get this construction underway, I have submitted the amendment to the committee amendment, as amended, so that out of the funds which already are provided in the bill, funds will be set aside or allocated to the Bureau of Reclamation for the initiation of construction of these transmission facilities.

I wish to give a little of the background of this proposal. The REA cooperatives in the western section of Minnesota made this proposal on their own volition for the advance construction of Bureau of Reclamation transmission lines. The

authorization for the Missouri River Basin project and its reclamation, irrigation, and hydroelectric facilities, includes the authorization of transmission facilities or transmission lines within the Missouri River Basin. The western portion of the State of Minnesota is within that basin.

This amendment to the committee amendment as amended, as I have pointed out, would not increase the appropriation; it would merely permit a share or portion of the appropriation, which has already been agreed to by the Senate in the sum of \$208,535,450 to be devoted to the purpose I have indicated.

Mr. President, those representing the REA's who testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee gave some moving testimony and made some moving comments pertaining to their particular problems of power and power distribution.

Because the time available for debate is limited, a little later I shall ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a statement which will in some detail outline the points I wish to make in the course of this discussion.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand, the amendment the Senator proposes to the committee amendment as amended would not increase the amount of the appropriation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct; it would not increase the amount of the appropriation.

Mr. LANGER. But the effect of adoption of the Senator's amendment to the committee amendment, as amended, would be to provide more for Minnesota by taking it away from North Dakota and South Dakota, as I understand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; I would say that we are trying to do for Minnesota what was done 2 years ago for North Dakota and South Dakota; this is an identical situation. This amendment amounts to a proposal for advance construction of Bureau of Reclamation transmission facilities.

Mr. President, what does my amendment to the committee amendment, as amended, really mean in terms of the economy of our part of the country and in terms of power facilities? It so happens that we have six major generating facilities in that particular area, at least some of which have considerable reserve power. If these generating facilities could be connected by means of a network, so as to constitute a transmission grid, they would be able to provide the additional electric power which is needed for all the distribution cooperatives and all the REA facilities in that particular area.

It is understood that approximately 60,000 kilowatts of electric energy lie in reserve in the six generating facilities, but those 60,000 kilowatts are of no use in meeting the power deficit in certain areas unless they can be tied into a unified, integrated system.

Two alternatives face these cooperatives: One is that they can apply to the

REA to borrow the money that is necessary to be had in order to build their own transmission lines and to tie in all of the six generating facilities. That would be a very expensive operation for the REA cooperatives, and of course it would place upon them a very large charge for the operation of that extensive transmission system.

The other alternative is to advance the date of construction of the transmission facilities to the fiscal year 1952, rather than the fiscal year 1954. It is the intention of and the proposal of and the projected program of the Bureau of Reclamation to build these transmission facilities in 1954 and 1955.

I am proposing that we advance the date of construction, and thereby meet the power needs on the one hand, and in the second place, I propose that we have these lines available at the time when the Missouri River power will be generated and will be extended into the States of North Dakota and South Dakota—to mention only two—and into western Minnesota.

This proposal is one which is not uncommon to the Congress; transmission facilities have been built all over the United States.

Under my proposal these transmission facilities would be rented by the REA cooperatives. The rental fee would be a charge upon the cooperatives. They likewise would be obligated to maintain the transmission facilities in all of their operations. Once the electric power from the Missouri River has been generated and was available, these lines would pass to the REA cooperatives in western Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say that in my State the REA is doing an excellent job, and I assume that the same is true in the Senator's State of Minnesota. If I thought the adoption of this amendment to the committee amendment as amended was necessary for the proper functioning of the REA, I would be glad to vote for it.

I should like to ask a question at this point, if I may do so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to answer one question. However, inasmuch as the time is limited, unless I can obtain some time from the opposition, I shall be able to answer only one question at this time.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask that I may be allowed 2 minutes by the opposition.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

My first question is as follows: Am I correct in assuming that this project is not included in the President's budget, and that both the House Appropriations Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee turned down this project?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; that is true. This project was not included in the budget request and it was not approved by either of the appropriations committees.

The same situation existed in the case of the power lines in South Dakota and the eastern cooperative power lines in North Dakota; they were not included in the Presidential budget. However, I commend the Congress for making the advance construction available, because it has meant a great deal to those States.

Mr. McCARTHY. My next question is as follows:

Mr. President, there is testimony in the record—and I refer to page 2116—to the effect that, in 1950, there was a margin of stand-by reserve of 136,395 kilowatts. There is further testimony to the effect that this reserve is greater than all the present requirements of all the REA cooperatives within the service area. There is further testimony to the effect that the power companies are willing to enter into a wheeling agreement to transport the power from the point of delivery to preferred customers of the Bureau of Reclamation, through facilities now available. In other words, there are three points: No. 1, that in 1950 there was a reserve of 136,395 kilowatts; No. 2, this reserve is greater than the need of the service area; and, No. 3, the power companies have the facilities, so that they can enter into wheeling agreements.

If that testimony is true, then this would be a waste of money. The REA's could get all the power they want, as it is. If the testimony is false, then I would like to have the Senator's comment upon it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate the questions of the Senator from Wisconsin, and I know of his interest in the REA program. I shall try to give him an answer which may be helpful. First of all, I would not dispute the fact that there is a surplus of power, but I also want to point out that that surplus of power is not where it is needed. It is like a gentleman who comes to Washington, D. C., and contacts the hotel association. He cannot get a room in Washington, there is no room in Baltimore, and there is no room in Philadelphia. The hotel association says there are 3,000 empty rooms, but they are all west of the Mississippi River. Mr. President, that does not meet the man's particular requirements.

I intend at this particular point to indicate, not what the power company has said, but what the representatives of 16 REA's testified to before the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Let me at this time simply read from some of the testimony. I have before me the testimony of Mr. Leroy C. Sabie, manager, Southwestern Minnesota Cooperative Electric, Pipestone, Minn., and vice president, Western Minnesota Power Cooperative, Benson, Minn. What does he say? From the same record that the Senator from Wisconsin mentioned, I read:

For many years now, and despite power company claims to the contrary, our member cooperatives have been faced with a critical shortage of electric energy. Many of our cooperatives are served by overloaded 33-kilovolt lines located on the periphery of company transmission systems.

What does that mean, when they are served by a 33-kilovolt line, an old trans-

mission line? It means that they have what is called an "outage," an interruption of service. I shall point out in the course of my remarks that many of these cooperatives have had industrial breakdowns lasting from 4 to 5 hours, because of overloading on their transmission lines. Believe me, if an industrial plant cannot stand that kind of interruption of service, neither can the farm cooperative. Mr. Sabie continues:

To further emphasize our problem * * * consider for just a moment the rates paid by our systems for this obviously inadequate service. The 16 cooperatives pay an average of 15.4 mills per kilowatt-hour. The average rate paid by all electric cooperatives in the United States is 8.6 mills per kilowatt-hour. A comparison of the rates we pay with the national average is clear indication of our predicament when considered together with the inadequate and insecure sources of supply.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Does it not happen invariably that when the Government contributes money for the generation of power which is to be transmitted into a certain area, the available supply of power in that area declines even before the power from the new source reaches the area?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that there are about 30,000 farmers in Minnesota who are not getting REA at the present time, the way they should?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator that thousands are not getting the supply they should. The Senator is correct. There are 55,000 families presently tied into these 16 cooperatives, who are complaining and worried about their power facilities, and particularly about the transmission facilities. I want to emphasize to the Senator from North Dakota that we are not simply talking about generating capacity; we are talking about transmission lines.

Mr. LANGER. And the actual service?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I have read the testimony in the record. I reread it a few moments ago, and this testimony is filled up with promises. But it is impossible to transmit electricity to the farms in Minnesota, or North Dakota, or South Dakota, on the basis of power-company promises. The record is replete with all kinds of evidence that the transmission lines are old and antiquated, and it was mentioned that the hydroelectric power looked as if it might cost the South Dakota lines and the Minnesota lines some electrical religion. They spread out maps, designs, and charts until it is impossible for one to see over them, but electricity cannot be transmitted with charts, promises, and maps; it takes transmission lines to transmit electricity.

Mr. President, what does this boil down to? It boils down to the fact that,

according to the testimony—and I am going to put this testimony in the Record—16 cooperatives presently serving 55,000 farm and other rural establishments have testified before a committee of the Congress—and I will take their word, for they are honorable, representative American citizens—that they need this transmission facility to tie in with what they already have; and everybody knows that an integrated system is more economical than one that is isolated and separated. These 16 REA cooperatives will be able to use the surplus power which they have if they can get a transmission system.

Mr. President, I also want to note at this time that the use of electrical energy has been skyrocketing in the State of North Dakota, in the State of South Dakota, and in the State of Minnesota. The rate of increase in the use of electrical energy has gone up 20, 25, or 50 percent, and the surface has merely been tapped.

Now what do I hear? I hear from the testimony on the part of private utilities who have come before the committee that they will take care of the demand in the future. That is what they said in 1930, it is what they said in 1935. I submit that they did not take care of it, and I submit that their recent recognition of the demands for transmission lines is what I call a "Johnny-come-lately" in their electrical religion. They recognized it only recently, when they saw that other power projects were going to be built.

I am pleading that the people of my State may share in cheap electrical power rates. I represent in part on the floor of the Senate 3,000,000 people, and I am here to state that we are sick and tired of paying 15 mills when we can get electricity for 5½ mills. I am here to say that the people, the municipalities, and the farms of Minnesota have a right to share in this great program of the Government. The system which is proposed is to provide for the transmission of power to load centers, and, from those load centers, REA's will get their electricity and the private utilities will get their electricity. I am surprised to see the selfishness of certain people in this fight. The private utilities—and I will present proof for the Record—get the lion's share of hydroelectric power. The REA cooperatives, according to a recent survey, get less than 3.5 percent of the hydroelectric energy generated in the United States. The private utilities are making more money than they have ever made before. They are not being driven out of business. Regarding their "wolf, wolf," cry that they are going bankrupt, I have the record from the Federal Power Commission here in my hand, and I am going to ask unanimous consent to have certain statistics and facts put in the Record.

All that is being asked for by my amendment is that a State of the Union, which has 3,000,000 people, which has made its fair contribution to the welfare of the Nation, be given some of the benefits which are now being given in the far West, in the Southeast, and in the Southwest. Minnesota is a part of the

Missouri River Basin, and I submit that if the Federal Government is going to spend money for the extension of generating facilities and transmission lines for every other State in that basin—and that is what we have done—my State of Minnesota is likewise entitled to that kind of consideration.

How much would this proposal cost the taxpayer? It would not cost the taxpayers anything, period. These lines will be paid for from the sale of power, plus 3 percent interest.

How much would it hurt the private utility? Not one whit, because I have the facts, which I shall present in this record, to show that the private utilities will share in this cheap power. But they do not want to share; they want it all. They want to wheel it all. They want to sell it all. They want all of it. Well, Mr. President, they are not going to get it, with my vote. I am here to say to them that I want them to stay in business, I want them to make a good profit. I am not for the abolition of private utilities. I want them to share in the whole program of hydroelectric generation; but I ask them to come here with clean hands, and I say that their record over the years is not one of clean hands. They did not serve the farmers of the country. They did not promote REA until within recent years, when they saw it was inevitable. They have not fought for the program of developing our natural resources. They have not favored Government hydroelectric generation. They fought Bonneville, they fought the TVA, they fought the Missouri River development. They fought it all, and now they want to fight the transmission lines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask the Senator from Arizona whether he will yield me 2 or 3 minutes more.

Mr. HAYDEN. I must yield some time to the Senator's colleague. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there are some remarks of my colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota, in which I could concur; but, in general, I cannot agree with him that now is the time to give consideration to the appropriation for these transmission lines. I am one person who was raised on a farm, who lived in a farm home in which there was no electricity. I am one who came in with 5-horse teams in the late fall months, and tried to put those teams away in the darkness of the evening. In the dim light of a lantern I have done chores around a dairy barn for hours upon hours. I have seen the dangers of a lamp placed on a table around which children were playing, and therefore, Mr. President, I yield to no one in this Chamber as a strong supporter and advocate of the rural electrification program and of the splendid work which has been done by the REA cooperatives in Minnesota and throughout the Nation.

Rural electrification has done more to improve the conditions of farm life than

any other Government program for agriculture.

It has brought increased safety, convenience, and comfort to our farm people wherever its benefits have become available.

I believe in the REA program and I shall continue to support it at every opportunity.

In the development of our hydroelectric power resources, there is only one agency that can effectively function, and that is the Government itself.

It is a proper field of operation by the Government to develop our natural resources for the advantage and benefit of all the people.

On this point there is no argument.

In making available the hydroelectric power developed in connection with flood control and reclamation projects, it is the duty of the Government to see that the electric current is made available at the best possible rates to the consumers, and particularly to the so-called preferred customers.

This latter group includes Government installations, rural electric cooperatives, and municipal power plants.

It has been the policy of Congress to avoid as much as possible a duplication in the distribution field, both in connection with the building and development of transmission lines and in the ultimate distribution to the consumer.

It is essential that both the resources of our Federal power administrations, our private utility companies, and our REA cooperatives should be utilized. It is for that reason, Mr. President, that I have advised the REA's and the Northern States Power Co., the utility which serves a vast number of the consumers and supplies the electrical needs of our State, to sit around a table and get together, because the Northern States Power Co. has transmission lines in much of the area where the people are asking that these transmission lines be built.

We need continuously to try to find that pattern of mutual effort by these agencies which will result in giving the consumer the advantage of the availability of electric power and the lower rates which are made possible by the large hydroelectric power developments.

For that reason I said they should get together, because there was an opportunity for the Northern States Power Co. to serve the REA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. THYE. May I ask of the chairman to allow me some additional time?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator may have another minute.

Mr. THYE. In connection with the proposed appropriations to enable the Reclamation Service to build transmission lines in southwestern Minnesota, which is involved in the amendment now pending, I believe it is important to keep in mind certain facts. In the first place, none of the power which it is proposed to utilize over the transmission line from the reclamation developments in South Dakota will be available until 1954, and some of it not until 1956 or 1957. Com-

plete operation will not be achieved for several years following that time.

The question of building the transmission lines is, therefore, not one of immediate necessity, as it is possible that we can explore this matter thoroughly in the next year to determine what will provide the best arrangement, without duplication and waste, to make this current available to the southwestern Minnesota farms and towns and other areas of the State.

Specifically, it is important to note that no justification for this appropriation, although requested, has been made by the Bureau of the Budget.

Secondly, the matter was considered by the House of Representatives, and in the absence of a Budget estimate the appropriation was not made. The matter was again considered by the Senate Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations with the same decision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the remainder of my statement, which is approximately one page, inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the remainder of the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As a matter of Government policy, it is my conviction that it would be unwise at this time to make an appropriation of \$7,000,000 for the proposed transmission lines in southwestern Minnesota, which ultimately would require a total of \$29,000,000.

A private utility, the Northern States Power Co., has a steam plant at Sioux Falls, and it contemplates extensive investments for the building of transmission lines to serve the entire area from Sioux Falls into southwestern Minnesota and other points in the State.

I believe that the company should be given an opportunity to present its plans and that all of the agencies involved should try to get together in an effort to find that program which will be most likely to give our REA co-ops and other consumers the benefits of the lowest possible rates and the best service available through these new hydroelectric power resources.

If it is not possible to reach such an understanding, or if private enterprise is unwilling and unable to furnish this service at rates equal to rates that would be charged if the transmission lines were built by Federal appropriations, it will then become not only possible but desirable to make an appropriation for this purpose.

For the reasons which I have cited, plus the added fact that we must keep nondefense appropriations at this time as low as we possibly can, I must oppose the amendment; but I wish to say that I shall continue to give close attention to the development and distribution of the electric current available as a result of the new hydroelectric power developments, as I believe it is the duty of Congress to take every possible precaution to see that this electric current is available to an increasing number of consumers at the best possible rates.

1. Northern States Power Co. average wholesale rate to Dakota County REA co-ops and other co-ops for 1950 was 1.2 cents per kilowatt-hour.

2. Dakota County Co-op farm rates: 40 kilowatt-hours at 7.5 cents per kilowatt-hour; 40 kilowatt-hours at 4 cents per kilowatt-hour; 120 kilowatt-hours at 2.5 cents per

kilowatt-hour; excess 1.75 cents per kilowatt-hour. Minimum charge per month \$3. Water heating, 1 cent per kilowatt-hour plus 20 cents per month.

3. Northern States Power rate to farm customers: 40 kilowatt-hours at 10 cents per kilowatt-hour; 40 kilowatt-hours at 6 cents per kilowatt-hour; 320 kilowatt-hours at 2.5 cents per kilowatt-hour; excess 2 cents per kilowatt-hour. Minimum charge per month, \$4. Water heating, 1.2 cents per kilowatt-hour.

Mower County Co-op paid Dairyland (REA) 1.5 cents per kilowatt-hour for year ending June 30, 1950.

Mower County Co-op paid Interstate (private utility) 1.17 cents per kilowatt-hour during same period.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared supporting my amendment be inserted at this point in the RECORD, together with two memorandums with reference to the same subject, and an article entitled "Study Shows Private Companies Get Major Share of Federal Hydro Power," appearing in the Rural Electrification magazine.

There being no objection, the statement, memorandums and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY IN SUPPORT OF SENATE APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF BUREAU OF RECLAMATION TRANSMISSION LINES IN WESTERN MINNESOTA

Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending appropriation bill for the Department of Interior to provide \$7,026,000 for the purpose of initiating construction of Bureau of Reclamation transmission lines in western Minnesota and Iowa, as proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation plans as presented to the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of Interior Appropriations. In order to provide funds for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of \$7,206,000, the figure appearing under the heading, "Construction and Rehabilitation," at page 18, line 21, of H. R. 3790, as reported to the Senate by Mr. HAYDEN on July 3, 1951, should be increased by that amount. Therefore, I now offer the appropriate amendment.

When the Congress authorized the development of the Missouri River Basin for purposes of reclamation, irrigation, navigation, and the production of hydroelectric power, plans were designed and projected for the transmission of hydroelectric power into all areas of the Missouri River basin. The western portion of Minnesota lies within that area. The western area of Minnesota has been and is now considered a part of the area to be served by the Missouri River development. The proposed plans for the construction of Bureau of Reclamation transmission lines includes western Minnesota. These lines under the original plans of the Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, were to be constructed by late 1954 and 1955. The proposal that I present is one to provide for advance construction of these transmission lines beginning with the fiscal year 1952. I urge favorable action on my proposal because of the critical situation which faces the Rural Electrification co-operatives in western Minnesota. The REA cooperatives in that area of my State on their own volition because of their own needs have come to the appropriate committees of the Congress, urging the advance construction of the transmission lines. Their proposal meets the tests of sound economy, prudent investment, and wise management. The very life of some of the

REA cooperatives in my State may depend upon the action taken by this Congress on the proposals that have been made, not by me, not by the Bureau of Reclamation, but by the people from Minnesota and Iowa regarding advance construction of certain Bureau of Reclamation lines in the Missouri Basin project.

The problem of getting adequate, reliable and economical electrical power is a serious one in Minnesota and nearby farm States. It is a grave concern to thousands of rural families and is of considerable interest to all other users of power. Although all consumers of power in the area are affected, the farmer is hit hardest. The tightness of the power supply is being felt now and will be felt more as farm labor moves into defense production and the Armed Forces. Farmers, with the highest production goals in history and with labor in short supply are looking to electricity as a major substitute for their lost manpower.

The problem of tight power supply in the area is expected to be solved in 1954 or 1955 when the Bureau of Reclamation, through its Missouri Valley Basin power development and its high-voltage transmission lines, can make an ample supply of hydro power available. However, there is a critical period between now and that time. Power is urgently needed right now and especially is it needed by farmers. At the present, farmer-owned REA distribution systems get their wholesale power from two sources: First, commercial utilities and municipalities and second, from farmer-owned REA generating and transmission plants.

Since the Bureau of Reclamation plans to have Missouri River Valley hydropower available by 1954 or 1955, suppliers in the first classification have little incentive to increase capacity through the construction of new fuel-burning plants. As a result, 16 REA distribution systems in Minnesota face the problem of how to meet present increased farm need for power in the critical period before Bureau of Reclamation power is introduced.

These distribution systems, working with six farmer-owned and farmer-managed generating systems in Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin and South Dakota, feel that they have developed a workable solution for the interim period. This involves the use of the standby capacity which the generating systems hold in reserve to assure dependable service to the distribution systems they serve. Each separate power-supply co-op has to have its own reserve. If all were in a single system, the total reserve needed would be much less than the total now installed by the separate systems. The hitch is that the six REA generating plants are not now connected by high voltage transmission lines. If they were so connected it would be possible to develop a power pool which would move reserve power to the point where it is needed. It would put some of this standby power to work to meet everyday needs.

The value of such a network of high voltage transmission lines is shown by the fact that all of these six generating systems will become users of Bureau of Reclamation power as soon as it is available. The Bureau already has plans to build such a network, but construction is scheduled for a few years ahead.

To avoid a 4-year power drought in a richly productive farm area, rural people through their spokesmen have asked that Congress start to do now what it would otherwise be doing 4 years from now, namely, to appropriate to the Bureau of Reclamation the sum of \$7,026,000 so that construction may be started at once on the high-voltage transmission network and its substations. Eventually the Bureau will build 1,050 miles of line and its total estimated cost is set at \$29,000,000. Getting this work under way this fiscal year will make the REA

power pool a reality and give farmers the assurance that they will have power in the period ahead and more power when the Bureau introduces hydro. You will recall that under Federal law, the rural distribution systems are the preferred customers of the Bureau of Reclamation and that it is our policy to see that their needs are not overlooked.

The plan which Minnesota and Iowa farmers have presented to solve their problem also makes allowance for the establishment of their own low-voltage transmission systems to supply the needs of the 16 Minnesota rural systems. The Rural Electrification Administration has given its approval to this plan and is prepared to make a loan of \$11,000,000 so that farm power needs may be met.

It is highly important, therefore, that integration and coordination of these systems be accomplished as soon as possible and, in addition, new supplies be provided to alleviate the growing shortage and meet rapidly growing loads. These areas are within reasonable transmission distance of the Missouri Basin power system now under construction, and by late 1953 and 1954 it is anticipated that power from the first large power plants at Fort Randall, S. Dak., and Garrison, N. Dak., will be available. However, earlier integration of the cooperative systems would contribute materially to alleviating the immediate situation.

It has, therefore, been proposed that certain lines of the Missouri Basin system be constructed at the earliest possible time to enable tying together these individual cooperative systems and making flexible interchange of power possible by this pooling arrangement. These lines would be trunk, or main transmission lines, 115- or 230-kilovolt, and would connect with similar lines now under construction in North and South Dakota at Grand Forks, and Fargo, N. Dak., Watertown, S. Dak., and Sioux City, Iowa. The proposed new lines would feed the various existing distribution systems of the cooperatives at various points such as Detroit Lakes, Fergus Falls, Benson, Maple Lake, Granite Falls, Currie, Worthington, Blue Earth, and Twin Lakes, Minn., and Humboldt, Mason City, Hampton, Fort Dodge, and Creston, Iowa.

This backbone of transmission would not only constitute advance construction of the ultimately needed Missouri Basin transmission system but by immediate construction would enable the cooperatives to relieve present shortages threatening their more than 150,000 members. Before Garrison and Fort Randall power plants are ready to supply power, the lines would be used to excellent advantage for improving the power situation by pooling the present supplies. The annual costs incurred for the use of such lines would be paid for by the cooperatives until such time as the Missouri Basin supply was transmitted over these lines at regular Missouri Basin rates.

The amount needed to immediately proceed with construction in 1952, is \$7,026,000. Ultimately the complete development of the trunk system in these two important States, it is estimated, will amount to approximately \$29,000,000, all of which would be repaid by power revenues as demonstrated by Missouri Basin financial studies.

At this time when our efforts must be spent both on meeting a critical defense situation and on preparing ourselves for a probable long economic struggle, it is doubly important to assure that existing power bottlenecks be prevented as much as possible. The areas concerned are highly pro-

ductive farming communities with many food processing plants and are vital to our national economic picture. The power needs are increasing each year and adequate power is essential to efficient economic support. This advance construction is fully feasible financially but even more important yet, is the means of assuring greater economic security, a matter of utmost importance. Since over 100 existing cooperatives involving ultimately 300,000 consumers are involved, this is not an isolated or relatively unimportant matter.

If these lines are not started this coming year, it simply means that the people in these areas will be increasingly handicapped by lack of power. The lines must go in eventually, but they will be doubly useful if they are expedited so that early increased supply and reliability is assured.

Once the Bureau of Reclamation high-voltage transmission project gets under way we will have done these things: (1) released 60,000 to 70,000 kilowatts of generating capacity which the rural systems now have in reserve and which can be moved to the points where it is needed; (2) relieved the pressure for power on commercial utilities and municipalities now serving the rural distribution systems; (3) developed a high-voltage transmission network which can be put to use now and to continued use as soon as the Missouri River hydroelectric power is made available; (4) solve the immediate power problem and permit farmers to make productive use of electricity for food production; and (5) do all this in a businesslike way since the wheeling charges which the rural systems will pay for use of the Bureau lines will start sooner than was anticipated.

The wise and careful planning which has gone into this proposal should not pass unnoticed. REA members and officers through progressive management planning, have developed a soundly engineered and businesslike solution to their power problem which takes into consideration the needs of all consumers of power, the Government's security and recovery of funds and the immediate farm needs.

This is an investment in productive capacity. The benefits which will arise out of it are so clear and compelling as to make us seem derelict in meeting our obligations if we fail to act.

In the light of these facts, I ask support of that \$7,026,000 be appropriated this year to the Bureau of Reclamation so that transmission-line construction may be hastened and farm needs met.

POWER-SUPPLY PROBLEMS

Now, let me explain in more detail the nature of the problem which confronts our REA cooperatives in western Minnesota. I have already outlined the general proposal and the benefits to be derived from the advance construction of the transmission lines. I want the Senate, however, to have more detailed information as to such factors as the condition of the existing transmission lines, the relationship of the REA cooperatives to municipal power plants and private utilities, the alternatives that the REA cooperatives face if these transmission lines are not constructed, the rate that is paid by Minnesota REA's for electrical power as compared to the national average and some of the savings that would be involved were these transmission lines constructed. Therefore, I give you the following detailed analysis:

Eighty-four distribution cooperatives have asked for this construction, and each of them has faced since its inception a con-

tinuous struggle to obtain adequate and reliable power at reasonable rates. Later, in this statement, I shall quote from the hearings in an effort to show just how critical the situation is. Of the 84 cooperatives asking for this construction, 68 have banded together into six federations and have installed generation and transmission facilities of their own. The 16 cooperatives in the southwest portion of the State of Minnesota who are not members of these federations continue to purchase power from utility companies and municipalities, and are the ones that face the most critical situation at this time.

The utility companies that serve the area are: Ottotail Power Co., Minnesota Power & Light Co., Interstate Power Co., and Northern States Power Co. Federal Power Commission figures seem to indicate that these companies have sufficient reserves of generating capacity to meet peak loads.

However, in the rural areas of my State, the electric power loads have far outstripped the capacity of transmission facilities, so even assuming the power to be available at the generating stations, it cannot be delivered to the cooperatives. These obsolete transmission facilities mean excessive outage time or interruption of service, and poor voltage regulation at the cooperative substations. And these cooperatives pay an average rate of 1.6 cents per kilowatt-hour for poor service while the national average rate paid by cooperatives is 0.86 cent per kilowatt-hour. The critical nature of the situation was emphasized about a year ago when one cooperative was notified that its wholesale power agreement would be terminated. Later on, I will quote from the hearings to illustrate this case.

The cooperatives have thus been faced with a rapidly increasing load and a more or less static power supply. There are two principal ways to cope with the situation. They can either build separate individual generation systems or in the case of cooperatives already possessing such facilities, expand them; or they can, by integrating already installed generation capacity through a network of transmission lines, secure the additional power by combining present facilities. It is simply not economical to install additional generation capacity at this time. The reason is that within 3 years, low-cost hydroelectric energy from Bureau of Reclamation dams on the Missouri River will be available. This will make it uneconomical to operate high-cost fuel-burning equipment, and any investment in such equipment will be lost when the dams come in. The only other alternative then is to build a network of transmission lines that can be used now to pool the already available generation facilities and transmit the power made available to the 16 cooperatives in the Southwest part of the State who do not have adequate power supplies. These same lines will form a permanent part of the Bureau of Reclamation system for transmission of Missouri Basin hydropower to preference customers when it becomes available.

THE PROPOSED PLAN

Specifically, the plan provides for the Bureau of Reclamation to immediately start construction of 890 miles of 115-kilovolt line and 160 miles of 230-kilovolt line together with 255,000 kilovolt-amperes of interconnected substation capacity. The total cost would be about \$29,052,000 of which \$7,026,000 would be required in fiscal 1952. Let me emphasize that these lines would be self-liquidating and would be rented to these cooperatives until they are needed to handle Missouri River hydroelectric power. The

lines would be built as indicated in the following table:

	Miles	Kilovolts
Valley City to Fargo, N. Dak.	173	115
Fargo to Detroit Lakes, Minn.	44	115
Detroit Lakes to Benson, Minn.	132	115
Benson to Maple Lake, Minn.	84	115
Benson to Currie, Minn.	90	115
Currie to Mankato, Minn.	95	115
Currie to Worthington, Minn.	33	115
Worthington to Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	64	115
Worthington to Blue Earth, Minn.	100	115
Blue Earth to Twin Lakes, Minn.	37	115
Blue Earth to Mankato, Minn.	40	230
Blue Earth to Humboldt, Iowa.	65	230
Humboldt to Storm Lake, Iowa.	55	230
Humboldt to Creston, Iowa.	125	115

This group of lines would form an interconnected system and would be energized by the generation capacity now installed and operating at six REA generation and transmission cooperatives in Iowa, Minnesota, North Dakota, and Wisconsin. The reserve capacity of these six cooperatives would then be available as a 60,000-kilowatt block of power that could be moved about the entire system to meet power shortages now being experienced by the 16 distribution cooperatives in my State. These 60,000 kilowatts would be contributed as follows:

	Kilowatts
Dairyland Power Cooperative, La Crosse, Wis.	10,000
Southwestern Federated Power Cooperative, Creston, Iowa.	-----
Corn Belt Power Cooperative, Humboldt, Iowa.	20,000
Rural Cooperative Power Association, Maple Lake, Minn.	10,000
Minnkota Power Cooperative, Grand Forks, N. Dak.	-----
Border County Power Cooperative, Warroad, Minn.	20,000
Total.	60,000

This 60,000 kilowatts of capacity made available through the integration plan would serve the following 16 cooperatives now experiencing the shortages as previously outlined:

	Number of members
Todd-Wadena Power & Light Cooperative, Wadena, Minn.	3,250
Runestone Electric Cooperative, Alexandria, Minn.	4,300
Lake Region Cooperative Electric Association, Pelican Rapids, Minn.	6,747
Traverse Electric Cooperative, Wheaton, Minn.	1,576
Agra Lite Cooperative, Benson, Minn.	3,390
Minnesota Valley Cooperative Light & Power Association, Montevideo, Minn.	5,180
Renville Sibley Cooperative Association, Danube, Minn.	2,003
Lyon-Lincoln Electric Cooperative, Tyler, Minn.	2,486
Southwestern Minnesota Cooperative Electric, Pipestone, Minn.	2,288
Federated Rural Electric Association, Jackson, Minn.	4,154
South Central Electric Association, St. James, Minn.	3,794
Nobles Cooperative Electric, Worthington, Minn.	3,964
Brown County Rural Electric Association, Sleepy Eye, Minn.	2,735
Central Minnesota Cooperative Power Association, Clements, Minn.	2,213
Blue Earth-Nicollet Cooperative Electric Association, Mankato, Minn.	3,585
Steel-Waseca Cooperative Electric, Owatonna, Minn.	4,061
Total.	55,708

ADVANTAGES OF PLAN

A review of this plan indicates the following advantages, and I quote from the statement of Mr. Edward Wolter, manager of the Rurau Cooperative Power Association, of Elk River, Minn., which appears on pages 1408-1413 of the House hearings:

"The many advantages of our proposal in preference to any other solution of the problem becomes evident upon reviewing the benefits to be obtained therefrom.

"1. First and foremost, it would quickly relieve a critical power shortage in a rural area affecting a large number of people.

"2. It would create a power pool with all of the attendant benefits usual to such arrangements, such as, releasing for use reserve standby generating capacity, diversification of loads thereby increasing load factors, greater security from outages because of multiple feeder lines, and so forth.

"3. After hydropower becomes available it would solve for many, many years the problem of securing low-cost power for approximately 300,000 electric consumers, which means well over a million people would be directly benefited.

"4. It would require a lesser outlay of manpower and materials than any other possible solution.

"5. It would effect an immediate savings in power generation costs because of the use of the standby units and because of other operating economies and a much greater savings will be effected when the hydropower becomes available.

"6. Because of lower-cost power it would permit the principle of area coverage to be furthered when materials are not needed for more direct defense purposes.

"7. It would enable the four private power companies and the 13 municipalities who are serving cooperatives to conserve generating capacity and materials since the cooperative loads would become more self-sufficient.

"8. It would enable the generation and transmission cooperatives to meet their power obligations to their member distribution cooperatives with a minimum of additional loan funds from REA for installing greater generating capacity."

Before proceeding with the presentation of the particular specific experiences of individual cooperative managers in trying to meet this power shortage in rural areas of Minnesota, I want it thoroughly understood that this plan was evolved by a qualified professional electrical engineering firm retained by the cooperatives. The engineering study was made by Mr. E. R. Mackie of Ellerbe & Co., of St. Paul, Minn., and I quote from his testimony before the House subcommittee which appears on pages 1433-1438 of the House hearings.

"Mr. Mackie, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am an engineer employed by the firm of Ellerbe & Co., of St. Paul, Minn. I am appearing here today in behalf of 16 REA-financed cooperatives in southern and western Minnesota.

"Ellerbe & Co. is the largest engineering organization in Minnesota. We have been doing load study and system design work for REA cooperatives in Minnesota and surrounding States for many years. We made the preliminary studies and the complete system design for Minnkota Power Cooperative at Grand Forks, N. Dak. This is one of the largest and most successful of the REA power cooperatives. Work connected with REA is less than 10 percent of our total annual business. We now have work in more than 20 States. The above statements are made only to give an indication of our qualifications to prepare the information contained herein.

"Ellerbe & Co. made the engineering studies for the 16 cooperatives in the south

and western areas of Minnesota. Their present requirements are supplied by 4 private utilities and 13 municipalities. A critical shortage of power and transmission facilities exists in the area.

"The municipalities in the area have done a fine job of helping the development of the REA Cooperative which they supply. The rapid increase in load experienced by the cooperatives, however, has caused the generating facilities of all but 3 of the 13 municipalities to be seriously overloaded. In many instances the REA load has become greater than their own load. It is not feasible for them to float a bond issue to install additional capacity to carry the REA loads. Seven of the municipalities have already requested that they be relieved of the necessity of carrying their REA loads. In most cases they are required to run every available unit of generation regardless of condition just to get by. For example, the municipal plant at Sleepy Eye lost one unit in November of 1950 which resulted in 3,200 REA members being out of service. They have served notice of cancellation of their contract with the REA cooperative.

"The Ottertail Power Co. serves the northwestern portion of this area. That company has served notice to REA cooperatives it cannot supply additional substations as more farms are served and as more load develops. It has refused to sign new contracts and, by so doing, has removed the only available source of power. The company's power shortage is so critical that it has served notice to some REA cooperatives that its present demand charge of \$2.25 per kilowatt will be increased 50 percent for substations covered by existing contracts if the load exceeded present contract limits.

"Our study further reveals that even if power were available the company's low-voltage transmission system is not adequate to carry the loads involved. The loads now being carried by this utility are so much beyond the efficient capacity of its facilities as to result in many cases of wide fluctuations of voltage and the cooperatives still have members who cannot be connected because of lack of power.

"The Interstate Power Co. serves the southern portion of the area. The cooperatives of this area are handicapped by the lack of adequate transmission facilities. A large portion of the lines owned by this company in this area is in the 24-kilovolt class. The company has indicated its willingness to do the best it can with these facilities, but it has placed low limits on the amounts of power that can be supplied to a given location.

"The Minnesota Power & Light Co. serves only four substations in this area.

"Two of the member cooperatives are supplied by REA-financed generating plants.

"The Northern States Power Co. serves the balance of the area. This company, being the largest of the four utilities involved, is naturally in the best position to serve its portion of the requirements. However, like the others, Northern States designed and built its systems before the REA cooperatives came into being. Our studies indicate that the company's system is not capable of carrying the anticipated loads without major revisions in transmission facilities and the installations of additional generating capacity.

"Our letter addressed to the four utilities and dated August 28, 1950, clearly indicates our problem and suggested solutions. This letter is attached for the record. We have received no answer to this letter from any of the utilities to whom it was sent.

"The cooperatives have realized for some time that they were rapidly reaching the limit of the available power supply. With

this in mind, and at the insistence of the cooperatives, we undertook a study and analysis of their power problems.

"We have completed this study. This study shows beyond any reasonable doubt that the demand for power already exceeds, and will rapidly outdistance, the existing available supply. This situation must be corrected at once, if the development of these cooperatives is not to be restricted.

"Our study further shows that the most practical and feasible solution is to place the Bureau lines in operation at the earliest possible date.

"We do not feel that such a solution would cause any of the utilities to suffer any loss from the facilities that they now own. By their own statements, their existing transmission facilities are inadequate, and by their own statements they do not now have the needed generating capacity. The proposed power pool would relieve them of the necessity of installing this generating capacity. The installation of the Bureau lines would relieve them of the necessity of a major re-vamping of their transmission system. We know of no other solution to this problem with so many benefits to all.

"With the Bureau lines in the area, the power supplied by the power pool can be distributed to the load centers of the individual co-ops by lines which the co-ops propose to build with REA loan funds. This phase of the transmission problem is further described in the communication from the Administrator of REA.

"I believe the solution we proposed is sound, effective, and desirable to 180,000 rural families in the Minnesota area. The Government investment, in my opinion, would be repaid in full.

"With a pooling arrangement of 60,000 kilowatts, that would allow this area to be furnished without additional generating capacity, whether by this utility or anyone else. That is the most important factor of the entire program that we are proposing here.

"Mr. ANDERSON. Would you please accentuate the fact that it is the desire of our group that this be done not alone for REA's but we also want to furnish power for municipalities or any private utilities that might hook up with this system?

"Mr. MACKIE. Our set-up shows that if we went to REA, or the utility, I don't care which, the Interstate Power Co., Northern States Power, Ottertail Power, Minnesota Power & Light and 13 municipalities, believe that every one of these utilities, if asked, will tell you that I have been in every one of their offices strictly on a business basis. I am as free to walk in there as I have ever been and our studies have shown this, that if they, or we, with REA finance, put in the generation in this area to carry our loads for the next few years, that the money that would have to be added to the utility systems to reach these loads, we would expend as a combination in these utilities more money than we are asking you people to give the Bureau. I believe that is a statement we are perfectly willing to have in the record.

"Mr. ANDERSEN. Might I add, Mr. Chairman, the Seventh Congressional District used energy to the extent of 74,000,000 kilowatt-hours. It is expected and estimated by people who should know that by 1960, 10 years hence, the consumption will have gone from 74,000,000 to 169,000,000, approximately two and one-half times the amount. That is the problem we must meet.

"Mr. MACKIE. I might mention right here, in conjunction with that, that this group went up 26 percent in 1949; 20 percent in

1950 and in 1950 purchased 180,000,000 kilowatt-hours with a maximum demand of 180,000,000 in 1950. If you project that ahead to 1960 at one-half the national average of increase, that is 8 percent, in other words, let us be ultraconservative, you are then taking 100,000, and what we particularly want to stress is the next 3 years. But if you take an average to 1960, these people will save between what they pay now and what they will save on Bureau rates, \$3,500,000 a year if we want to start projecting into the future.

"But the pertinent point is existing for the next 2 or 3 years.

"Mr. ANDERSEN. Again, with the permission of the chairman, I think we should get down to cases and tell the committee just what we would like to do. * * * What would be your estimate that we would need in fiscal 1952 if the Congress did grant such an appropriation?

"Mr. MACKIE. The Bureau has prepared a preliminary approach or budget covering this small-scale map of which I believe each of you has a copy. For the lines we are requesting in North Dakota, Minnesota, and Iowa, lines and substations, the Bureau's preliminary budget is approximately \$25,000,000, as was read in the previous testimony here. The red line on that map with substations and facilities is approximately \$11,000,000. That is, of course, handled by REA.

"Mr. ANDERSEN. What is the condition of this \$11,000,000 loan proposed from REA?

"Mr. MACKIE. The Administrator has entered a record here, or allowed us to enter a letter in the record, that if the Bureau of Reclamation is given the money for the blue line shown on this map, and that is merely a portion of what is shown on the small-scale map, then under these conditions the Administrator will make a loan to this group of \$11,000,000 to allow for the distribution of that energy to the ultimate consumer.

"Mr. ANDERSEN. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that all these gentlemen realize that they are speaking to a subcommittee of which each and every member has been 100 percent a friend of REA. I just want you gentlemen to know that you are talking to a group of friends. I would suggest if the subcommittee has any questions before our time expires we should like to answer them before resting our case.

"Mr. FURCOLO. Just in brief, as I understand it, what you have in mind is simply more or less advancing the project which eventually is to be carried on; and you are in an emergency situation at the present time and do not have the needed power. So, if we look ahead 4 or 5 years, there would not be any difficulty in the amount of money?

"Mr. MACKIE. If I may answer that question. Actually, we are asking for not \$1 that is not backed by the Bureau's present plan. All we are asking is that that construction be advanced to save us the necessity of going back to REA or to a utility—we do not wish to leave the utilities out of our recommendation—there is so much capacity needed in the area and all we are asking, suggesting, is that amount of money is going to be spent in the next 2 or 3 years—or someone will be without power. All we ask is the money be spent now for what the money will have to be spent for ultimately."

ESTIMATES ON THE POWER POTENTIAL OF THE MISSOURI RIVER HYDROELECTRIC PROJECTS AND THE RELATIONSHIP TO PREFERENCE CUSTOMERS AND PRIVATE UTILITIES

The Flood Control Act of 1944 specifically describes certain preference customers to be served by public-power projects. In this list of preferred customers are to be found the REA cooperatives and municipal power facilities. The 1944 act, while providing for preference customers does in no way deny

the private utilities purchase or sale of hydroelectric generated power once the needs of the preferred customers have been met. Now, what are the facts concerning the power potential of the Missouri River Basin projects?

The Bureau of Reclamation estimates that the initial operation of Missouri River Basin projects including Fort Randall, S. Dak., and Garrison, N. Dak., projects will produce approximately 260,000 kilovolt-amperes. This initial operation or production of hydroelectric power will be followed by other projects on the Missouri River giving an estimated total of 480,000 kilovolt-amperes. Of this total, approximately 360,000 kilovolt-amperes will be firm power. The balance of 120,000 kilovolt-amperes will be known as secondary or dump power. The high proportion of firm power is due to the heavy flow of the Missouri which on a yearly average is 25,000 acre-feet. The reservoir system being constructed in the Missouri Basin will provide for approximately 75,000,000 acre-feet of water in continuous reserve or in reservoirs.

This means that there will be a reserve supply of water available for 3 years' hydroelectric generation. This reserve water production has been planned not only because of flood-control purposes but also because of the variation of water supply in the Missouri River Basin. I bring these estimates by the Bureau of Reclamation to your attention because I want it clear that while the preference customers will, of course, be served as required by the 1944 Flood Control Act, there will be an ample supply of hydroelectric power for both preferred customers and the private utilities. This is particularly true if the private utilities maintain their steam generation plants. The steam generation facilities can be used in the Missouri River Basin just as they are used in other areas of the country to firm up the secondary or dump power. By this process, the private utilities will share in the program.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the Bureau of Reclamation is constructing only trunk lines. The Bureau transmission lines go to wholesale load centers. It is from these load centers that both the preferred customers and the private utilities can and will receive low cost electric power for their respective systems.

The question has been raised as to why the Bureau of Reclamation should construct these transmission lines. The private utilities say why not leave it to the private companies. The answer to this query was clearly given in the Federal Power Commission Report of 1943 on the Missouri River Basin hydroelectric potentialities. That report stated that isolated separate hydroelectric generation facilities on the Missouri River would be uneconomical and unfeasible. However, an integrated hydroelectric system where all power plants were tied in together and where a basic trunk system of transmission lines was constructed for the purpose of pooling all power would be highly desirable, practical, economic, and feasible. It is this integrated system that is presently being constructed. It is because integration is mandatory that the Bureau of Reclamation transmission lines are vital to the sound economic operation of the hydroelectric generation facilities. These transmission lines will provide lower costs to the customers and thereby make a substantial saving to the area served. At the same time the cost of these transmission lines will be liquidated by the sale of power.

In conclusion the following facts are evident: The total generation capacity of the Missouri River hydroelectric facilities is more than adequate to meet the contemplated requirements of the preference customers. The generation of both firm and secondary power in substantial quantities will also provide power for private utilities.

The transmission of the hydroelectric power over the Government-owned lines will reduce the rates and thereby serve the economic welfare of the purchasers of electricity for both the preferred customers as defined by the Flood Control Act of 1944 and the private utilities. Already the Bureau of Reclamation has entered into contracts with private utilities for Missouri River Basin hydro power. This within itself is convincing evidence that the private utility will not be denied the benefits of Missouri River power.

Therefore, when hydroelectric power is available from the Missouri River generation facilities, the Bureau of Reclamation will sell the power to REA's, to municipalities, to private utilities. The rate is estimated at 5½ mills per kilowatt. This rate is substantially lower than is available anywhere in the Midwest. At present Minnesota REA's are paying anywhere from 12 to 15 mills per kilowatt. The Bureau rate at 5½ mills will not only result in a great economic saving to the people but it will also result in a sum of money to repay the Federal Treasury for all costs involved in generation and construction and operation of transmission lines. It will also afford a 3-percent interest payment on the principal. It will also provide a fund for purposes of irrigation and reclamation. Thus the Federal Treasury will be repaid for advance appropriations and the consumer is rewarded by sharply reduced electrical power rates.

Electric power vital to farm production

The farmers of the State of Minnesota are indeed aware of the significance of their contribution to a strong and prepared America. They are aware of their responsibilities in meeting the Nation's requirements of full production of agricultural products.

The Secretary of Agriculture has recently stated that "Agriculture's job is to produce the food and fiber we need for the strength and vitality of our Armed Forces, for the health and productivity of our civilian population, for ample reserves, and for shipments to those other nations to which it is advisable to give aid." The Secretary clearly revealed the importance of the farmers of our Nation when he pointed out that "less than one-fifth of our population is on farms, and they provide the food and fiber for themselves and the other four-fifths of our population."

The farmers of America, the farmers of Minnesota, are determined to meet this challenge of increasing their productivity. But to do so will require that they be supplied with adequate supplies of electric power at rates low enough to encourage increased use of electricity on the farm. The demand for and use of electricity on our Nation's farms has been increasing at an astounding rate. During the past 10 years farmer-members of rural electric systems have increased their demand for electric power by some 20 times, and in 1950 they used 25 percent more electricity than in 1949.

The Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, in his report for 1950, said that adequate low-cost power is basic to the operation and growth of the program. He indicated, in the same report, that lack of adequate power supply to meet the growing needs of rural consumers during 1950 has resulted in the curtailment of increases in consumption of power and extension of distribution lines to farmers in the State of Minnesota and in other areas in the country.

This, then, is the concern of the rural electric system of the State of Minnesota—that they have adequate supplies of electric power to meet the increasing demands of their farmer-members at rates low enough to encourage complete utilization of electricity on the farms of Minnesota.

Here is what these farmers of Minnesota have to say about their need for adequate

and dependable sources of electric power: Leroy C. Sabie, manager, Southwestern Minnesota Cooperative Electric, Pipestone, Minn., and vice president, Western Minnesota Power Cooperative, Benson, Minn.:

"For many years now, and despite power company claims to the contrary, our member cooperatives have been faced with a critical shortage of electric energy. Many of our cooperatives are served by overloaded 33-kilovolt lines located on the periphery of company transmission systems.

"To further emphasize our problem, consider for just a moment the rates paid by our systems for this obviously inadequate service. The 16 cooperatives pay an average of 15.4 mills per kilowatt-hour. The average rate paid by all electric cooperatives in the United States is 8.6 mills per kilowatt-hour. A comparison of the rates we pay with the national average is clear indication of our predicament when considered together with the inadequate and insecure sources of supply. Our 16 cooperatives are serving about 55,000 farm and other rural establishments, and have exhausted every possibility of obtaining additional power except self-generation. As I have said, the companies and municipalities that serve us are apparently unable to grow along with us."

Charles L. Pullen, manager, Ida County Rural Electric Cooperative, Ida Grove, Iowa: "Average consumption of our members has increased from 82.5 kilowatt-hours in April 1945 to 376 kilowatt-hours in April 1950, and 455 kilowatt-hours in April 1951.

"The power companies have said many times that they will provide any necessary transmission facilities but for 12 years they have made no improvements in our service.

"I have received a number of letters from members requesting that funds be provided the Bureau of Reclamation for the purpose of providing us with dependable and adequate transmission facilities."

Mauritz Nelson, secretary, board of directors, Rural Cooperative Association, Elk River, Minn.; manager, Kandiyohi Cooperative Electric Power Association, Willmar, Minn.:

"Our generation and transmission cooperative started operation in 1940 with one power plant. It has a capacity of 3,700 kilowatts. The increase in power requirements of our members and the lack of an adequate source of power necessitated the construction of five additional plants. The total system generating capacity now is 43,000 kilowatts."

Earl E. Huber, counsel, Traverse Cooperative, Wheaton, Minn.:

"Our cooperative now is receiving power at several substations without benefit of contracts with the supplier. We have been unable to come to terms with the company on a basis that would provide our cooperative with an adequate and dependable supply of power at a price we can afford to pay."

S. C. Martensen, manager, Lyon-Lincoln Electric Cooperative, Tyler, Minn.:

"Our average cost of power in 1950 was 16 mills, which we understand is about double that being paid on an average by REA-financed electric cooperatives.

"Even more serious than the costs is the fact that the municipal plant, as well as the transmission lines of both power companies, are now loaded to the extent that we know they cannot furnish us enough power in the years to come."

Charles H. Carl, manager of the Nobles Cooperative Electric, Worthington, Minn.:

"The supply of power in certain sections of our area is becoming increasingly critical. Our power requirements are increasing rapidly, and judging from present conditions it is extremely doubtful that our ultimate load could be served by the present facilities in our area.

"The voltage at our substations varies considerably due to the suppliers' lines being overloaded at peak-load hours.

"Service to some four substations is interrupted frequently because of the run-down condition of the lines which supply them. Outages caused by line failures last as long as 4 or 5 hours.

"Our rate for purchase power we believe, is excessive. It costs us between 12 to 15 mills per kilowatt-hour. The cooperative furnishes all substation structures, transformers, and any line switches needed by the supplier to serve our substations. This adds to our cost of power."

George Comstock, president of the Federated Rural Electric Association, Jackson, Minn.:

"We have been plagued for many years by a serious power shortage. To secure power for our system we had contracts with six sources, namely, two sources on the Interstate Power Co. lines, one from Fairmont municipal power plant, one from the Jackson municipal power plant, one from the Lakefield power plant, and one from the Windom municipal power plant. The sources at Windom, Lakefield, and Jackson were very weak. In two sources our load was surpassing the municipal plants' own distribution load. The power from Jackson and Lakefield was mostly interruptible power; that is, power available only when all units were in operating condition. There were times when the REA switch was pulled at the plants when equipment failed—and our members were in the dark. I recall one winter a couple of years ago when, from 4:30 p. m. until 6 p. m., various sections of our lines had to be cut off so that the load would not exceed the capacities of the sources.

"This type of operation is serious and our members complained severely about these conditions.

"It affected cooking, water supply, brooding, and so forth. It was right at milking time, too. The interstate power sources were very weak. During storms we have had to send our crews out on their lines to help repair them.

"Prices for power were exorbitantly high. We paid the Windom, Minn., municipal plant 24 mills per kilowatt-hour and the Lakefield plant varied from 15 to 19 mills per kilowatt-hour. These high prices forced us to raise our retail rates to our members.

"I mention the foregoing as a matter of history and to give an indication of the power problems being faced by the individual cooperatives. The load is growing at a tremendous rate. In 1947 we used 8,000,000 kilowatt-hours and in 1950 we used 16,000,000 kilowatt-hours. We are attaching charts No. 5042-2 and No. 5042-1 prepared by Pfeiffer & Shultz, registered professional engineers of Minneapolis, showing our total consumption in kilowatt-hours, peak demand in kilowatts, number of connected customers, and average yearly consumption per member."

Oscar Torstenson, secretary of the Minnesota Valley Cooperative Light and Power Association, Montevideo, Minn.:

"In 1948 this cooperative purchased 9,605,340 kilowatts. In 1950 our cooperative purchased 16,322,530 at an average cost of 13.45 mills, a total sum of \$219,912.44. This shows an increase in the use of electric power of 70 percent in a period of 2 years."

Arthur P. Zschetzsch, president of the Brown County Rural Electric Association, Sleepy Eye, Minn.:

"Since our power-supply problem became so critical we have been scouting every possibility in the area to get more energy. We have mentioned one source of power. Another possible source is the Interstate Power Co. We have been negotiating with its officials for some time. In correspondence we asked the company to sell us 800 kilowatts of energy at one point. The company advised us it could provide us with only about 400 kilowatts, or only one-half of the anticipated need at this one point. Thus, the over-all shortage of power in the area is emphasized."

Henry Sieling, Lake Region Cooperative Electric Association, Perham, Minn.:

"At the present time approximately 94 percent of the power is purchased from the Otter Tail Power Co. at a rate of \$2.25 per kilowatt on demand and energy at 7 mills per kilowatt-hour, with an average fuel adjustment of three-tenths mill per kilowatt-hour, with no terms for discount for cash payment within 10 days from billing date, which is usually offered in the industry. Approximately 6 percent of the power is purchased from the Minnesota Power & Light Co. at a rate of \$1.30 per kilowatt on demand, and energy at a rate of 7.7 mills per kilowatt-hour, with an average fuel adjustment of \$0.00059 per kilowatt-hour, and 2-percent discount if paid within 10 days of billing.

"In 1949 our association paid 44 percent of its gross revenue for its wholesale power, and in 1950 the cost was even more, nearly 50 percent.

"In 1950, this association purchased 18,539,824 kilowatt-hours at a total cost of approximately \$315,177. Using the ultimate rate proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation, a net saving of approximately \$151,583 would be realized by this association, using 1950 power-purchased figures. This tremendous saving would extremely enhance the position of this association to provide adequate power to its members at a reasonable rate, without straining their members' ability to use electricity to its fullest advantage for farm production."

Marvin Sunvoid, member, board of directors, Renville Sibley Cooperative Power Association, Danube, Minn.:

"Since the advent of electric power on the farms in my community, and this is true of farms throughout the country, we farmers have developed the use of electricity to so many productional uses that a constant and adequate supply of power has become a matter of great importance. In fact, most of us would be unable to carry on our work in producing dairy and poultry products without a firm supply of electric power. Our use of electricity is rising rapidly. We must look to our future needs in the light of our present experience. This means that a power supply that is barely meeting our needs today will be very inadequate tomorrow.

"If our farmers in Renville and Sibley Counties are going to have adequate power in the future, they must have, and certainly are entitled to service from Bureau of Reclamation transmission lines that will have capacities enough to deliver energy to them as their uses for electricity develop and expand."

Recognizing that they must cooperatively find a solution to their power supply problems, these rural electric systems in Minnesota have joined together with their neighboring rural electric cooperatives in Iowa and Wisconsin in this proposal that the Bureau of Reclamation be allowed to construct, in advance of schedule (just as in North and South Dakota), certain transmission facilities which will enable the rural electric systems to meet their power demands until Missouri River power becomes available—at which time the Bureau's transmission facilities will be used to transmit power from dams in the Missouri River Basin. The farmers of Minnesota are proposing an economically sound investment by the Federal Government, an investment that means adequate power now and millions of dollars in ultimate savings in rates for the farm people of Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin. A great deal of time, effort, and money has been spent in Minnesota to devise this method of solving their power supply problems, a proposal that is made in the best interests of the Federal Government, the taxpayers of this country, and the farmers of the area. All the rural electric systems of Minnesota are asking is that the Federal Gov-

ernment, the Congress, cooperate with them in their efforts to guarantee the farmers of Minnesota adequate electric power at rates that will enable them to achieve maximum production on their farms.

BACKGROUND MATERIAL ON PREFERENCE PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL POWER POLICY

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

Preferences: Preference in the sale of electric energy produced at Federal power projects should be given to public agencies and cooperatives to insure the benefits for the general public and particularly for domestic and rural consumers. (Cf. Reclamation Act of 1906, the Raker Act of 1913, Federal Water Power Act of 1920, Boulder Canyon Act of 1928, Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 Rural Electrification Act of 1936, Bonneville Act of 1937, Fort Peck Act of 1938, Reclamation Project Act of 1939, Flood Control Act of 1944.)

It will be noted that these priority provisions and related provisions have been enunciated in every pertinent Federal law since 1906.

Perhaps it would be helpful if the language of the law itself were set out from one of these acts. Let's take the last one, particularly inasmuch as it is the one applicable to the Missouri Valley projects being constructed by the Army engineers. Section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 reads as follows:

"Electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. Rate schedules shall be drawn having regard to the recovery (upon the basis of the application of such rate schedules to the capacity of the electric facilities of the projects) of the cost of producing and transmitting such electric energy, including the amortization of the capital investment allocated to power over a reasonable period of years. Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, from funds to be appropriated by the Congress, to construct or acquire, by purchase or other agreement, only such transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated at said projects available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies. All moneys received from such sales shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts (58 Stat. 890; 16 U. S. C. A. 8255)."

Despite many fights and a few rare exceptions, this Federal law as regards priorities has been amply supported by every Congress since 1906, which has dealt with any phase of the power program. So far as I know, there has never been a serious attempt to repeal any of these priority provisions.

The self-liquidating Federal transmission lines are built for two purposes: (1) integration, and (2) for the delivery of the Federal power into the load center areas where it there may be purchased by publicly owned systems, cooperatives, and the commercial companies.

Congress has always regarded the transmission lines as necessary for several purposes: (1) to prevent monopoly, since the

power companies are generally the only ones big enough to go to the dams after the power; (2) to guarantee that at least some of the power may be sold to the people's own power organization. (This is not exactly a part of the first of (1), as I shall attempt to show later.)

The administration and/or sale by Congress of property belonging to the United States and held in trust for the people in the interest of conservation and widespread utilization of such properties has been repeatedly sustained by the courts. The Supreme Court of the United States has uniformly sustained the power of Congress to adopt all reasonable means of disposition in order to make a widespread distribution of the benefits of Government property, to enact regulations, and to undertake extensive affirmative projects as well. (*United States v. Gratiot*; *Campfield v. United States*; *Ruddy v. Rossi*.)

Let me give you an example of what happens when this policy is not followed:

A group of rural people in southern California organized what was known as Mesa Electric Cooperative on the assurance of a power supply from Southern California Edison Co. or California Light & Power Co. After the co-op lines were constructed, the power companies refused to sell the co-op power. There were no other co-ops in the area. Generation of its own power was impractical by the co-op. The co-op made many pleas both to the power companies and Federal officials for relief. The pleas were made to the Federal officials because Hoover Dam power was being brought into the Mesa Co-op area by the power companies which were purchasing tremendous quantities of Hoover Dam power. The power companies nevertheless steadfastly refused to sell power to the co-op, and since it was not close enough to the dam to build its own lines, the cooperative was finally forced out of business. It was forced to sell its properties for what it could get.

It is not a question of the municipalities and co-ops being able to get their fair share of the power. It is a question of the necessity of this priority in order for them to get any substantial amount of power. Note the following sales of Federal power as reported by the Federal Power Commission for last year: The Commission reported that the commercial power companies got 19 percent of federally generated power, municipally owned systems got 21.4 percent, and rural electric cooperatives got only 3.5 percent. If we should remove the TVA figures from these purchases, it would appear that we are faring even much worse than these figures indicate. In other words, exclusive of the TVA area, the power companies purchase a much higher percent of Federal hydro power than is herein indicated, and the municipalities and rural electrics purchase a lower percent.

So you see, it is not only a question of monopoly, for if the Federal Government sold the power at the bus bar without any priority, there would usually be only one or two customers and they would be the big power companies; it is also a question of simple existence on the part of rural electrics. The rural electrification program has been built up in many parts of the West on the strength of this priority provision. If the provision is destroyed, the cooperatives' power sources will be destroyed and many of them surely will pass out of existence. Many REA loans have been made upon the strength of these priority provisions which operate as a sort of guaranty of power supply. Most of the co-ops in the west are entirely too isolated and fuel costs are too high for them to be able to justify generating their power either separately or collectively.

In Minnesota, the cooperatives are naturally concerned about purchasing some of the Missouri River Basin power. If it is all sold to the power companies, the farmers,

through their rural electric systems, will probably get little if any benefit. It is a matter of well established history that the power companies usually claim to the State commissions that they are obtaining the power at no lower costs than are contained in their own generation, and therefore they consistently do not pass the benefits on to the people. I'm afraid that if the rural electric co-ops are able to negotiate any wheeling agreements with the power companies, it will be because of two bargaining factors: (1) the priority provision in the laws, and (2) because of their right to generate their own power as an alternative.

PRIVATE UTILITIES—ECONOMIC DATA

1. The number of private power companies obtaining power from Government agencies: From the—

Bureau of Reclamation.....	35
Bonneville Power Administration.....	5
Southwestern Power Administration.....	5
Southeastern Power Administration.....	1

Total 46

2. Percentage of the total output of Government power used by private utilities:

	Percent
Bureau of Reclamation.....	22
Bonneville Power Administration.....	25
Southwestern Power Administration.....	92

Unable to get figure from Southeastern Power Administration as of this moment.

Figures from Bureau of Reclamation, Bonneville Power Administration, and Southwestern Power Administration obtained by telephone from those agencies.

1. Private electric utility generating capacity as of December 31, 1950: Total, 55,175,623 kilowatts.

2. Private utility capacity for 1945 through 1950, broken down into hydro, steam, and internal-combustion generating plants:

1945:	Kilowatts
Hydro.....	8,867,290
Steam.....	31,075,320
Internal combustion.....	364,569

Total..... 40,307,179

1946:	Kilowatts
Hydro.....	8,858,602
Steam.....	31,110,426
Internal combustion.....	365,517

Total..... 40,334,545

1947:	Kilowatts
Hydro.....	8,865,733
Steam.....	32,703,591
Internal combustion.....	417,153

Total..... 41,986,482

1948:	Kilowatts
Hydro.....	9,028,184
Steam.....	35,790,557
Internal combustion.....	562,144

Total..... 45,380,885

1949:	Kilowatts
Hydro.....	9,334,669
Steam.....	40,542,513
Internal combustion.....	606,789

Total..... 50,483,971

1950:	Kilowatts
Hydro.....	9,662,934
Steam.....	44,888,420
Internal combustion.....	624,269

Total..... 55,175,623

Capacity of generating plants of 100 percent of private utilities

	Increase	Total (hydro, steam, and internal combustion)
	Kilowatts	Kilowatts
1945.....	40,307,000	40,307,000
1946.....	27,000	40,334,000
1947.....	1,652,000	41,986,000
1948.....	3,394,000	45,380,000
1949.....	5,103,000	50,483,000
1950.....	4,692,623	55,175,623

Private utilities in the United States

	Electric utility operating income	Total utility operating income	Net income
1945.....	\$767,658,000	\$832,720,000	\$534,454,000
1946.....	763,438,000	829,073,000	637,626,000
1947.....	765,195,000	815,367,000	642,682,000
1948.....	784,368,000	829,734,000	656,808,000
1949.....	895,251,000	956,017,000	757,259,000
1950.....	960,894,600	1,033,077,000	821,942,000

Key: Operating income: Income minus operating expenses, depreciation and taxes. Interest on debt and long-term loans included in operating income. Net income: Includes dividend payments.

Investment—Classes A and B privately owned electric utilities (98 percent of this division of the industry)

	Electric utility plant less reserve	Other utilities	Total utility less reserve
1950.....	\$15,104,326,000	\$1,951,401,000	\$17,055,728,000
1949.....	13,753,168,000	1,800,011,000	15,553,180,000
1948.....	13,753,168,000	1,800,011,000	15,553,180,000
1947.....	13,753,168,000	1,800,011,000	15,553,180,000
1946.....	13,753,168,000	1,800,011,000	15,553,180,000
1945.....	13,753,168,000	1,800,011,000	15,553,180,000

Key: Reserve is depreciation and amortization.

Source: E. C. Craig, Division of Finance and Statistics, FPC.

STUDY SHOWS PRIVATE COMPANIES GET MAJOR SHARE OF FEDERAL HYDRO POWER—CO-OPS BOUGHT ONLY 3.5 PERCENT FROM FOUR AGENCIES IN 1950

Even though rural electric cooperatives—as non-profit utility operators—have preference rights for purchasing Federal hydro-electric power, they were able to purchase only 3.5 percent of the total wholesale power produced by the four major power agencies of the Federal Government during fiscal 1950. Private power companies ranked as one of the four major purchasers of Federal power last year, buying 19 percent of all the power produced by those agencies. Others are the Federal Government itself, private industries which buy large wholesale blocks directly, and municipalities.

NRECA MADE STUDY

These facts were revealed last month in a study announced by NRECA. The study was made to support requests by rural electric systems in various sections of the country for either Federal transmission lines or REA-financed generating and transmission systems.

Only with Federal transmission of wholesale power to rural load centers, NRECA members have previously testified before Congress, can a fair disposition of Federal hydro power be possible; similarly, loan studies have shown that integrated use of wholesale Federal power with federated REA-financed rural electric power plants can provide the lowest cost power supplies available to rural systems anywhere in the Nation. Federated systems in Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri have already obtained loans based on these studies.

SOUTHWEST COMPANIES GET 94 PERCENT

While private power companies in the area are fighting the REA loans in district court and State regulatory commissions, the NRECA studies last month revealed that 94.5 percent of all the power sold by the Southwestern Power Administration there is obtained by private power companies. Under such circumstances, rural electric leaders have argued that the Federal preference clauses for wholesale power sales to either municipal or rural systems have no effect unless Federal transmission lines make integrated power supply possible through arrangements such as those provided with their REA loans.

The study of Bonneville Power Administration wholesale power sales in fiscal 1950 shows private industries there took 52 percent of the agency's production, even before the Nation's mobilization program got under way. The aluminum industry alone bought 44.9 percent of Bonneville's power. Despite expanding public districts formed under Washington and Oregon State laws, private companies rank second among Bonneville's customers, purchasing 25 percent of BPA's capacity.

In the study, analysis of sales by TVA and the Bureau of Reclamation show that large blocks of power were purchased by 20 private power companies at rates as low as 2 mills per kilowatt-hour. Two of the same private companies with two others and their subsidiaries purchased over 3,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours from Bonneville at an average cost of 2.41 mills. These statistics will be compared by rural electric leaders to costs of 6 to 20 mills for power purchased from private companies in the same areas, most of it from the same companies getting Federal wholesale hydro output in generous quantities.

PURCHASES ITEMIZED

The NRECA study includes a break-down of the disposal of Federal wholesale power during fiscal 1950 as follows:

	Kilowatt-hours	Customers' shares
Bonneville Power Administration:	Billions	Percent
Aluminum industry.....	5.86	44.9
Other industry.....	.98	7.5
Municipalities.....	.88	6.8
Cooperatives.....	.26	2.0
Public utility districts.....	1.69	13.0
Private utilities.....	3.31	25.4
Others.....	.05	.4
Total.....	13.03	100.0
Tennessee Valley Authority:	Billions	Percent
Aluminum industry.....	2.00	14.1
Other industry.....	1.69	11.9
Municipalities.....	6.02	43.5
Cooperatives.....	1.25	8.8
Private utilities.....	.65	4.6
Chemical, construction.....	.58	4.1
Federal agencies (AEC).....	1.97	13.9
Others.....	.01	.1
Total.....	14.17	100.0
Bureau of Reclamation:	Billions	Percent
Federal resale (BPA).....	10.50	53.1
Private utilities.....	4.64	23.3
Industry.....	.06	.3
Municipalities.....	3.27	16.5
Cooperatives.....	.14	.7
State government utilities.....	.60	3.0
Public authorities.....	.47	2.4
Others.....	.12	.7
Total.....	19.80	100.0
Southwestern Power Administration:	Billions	Percent
Private utilities.....	.41	94.5
Cooperatives and 1 municipality.....	.02	5.5
Total.....	.43	100.0

Footnote at end of table.

SUMMARY

	Kilo-watt-hours	Cus-tomers' shares
	<i>Billions</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Industry.....	10.59	22.3
Municipalities.....	10.17	21.4
Cooperatives.....	1.67	3.5
Public authorities.....	2.16	4.6
Private utilities.....	9.01	19.0
Federal resale.....	10.50	22.2
Federal agencies.....	1.97	4.2
State government utilities.....	.60	1.3
Chemical, construction.....	.58	1.2
Others.....	.18	.3
Total.....	47.43	100.0

¹ Under the breakdown of the Bureau of Reclamation energy sales, there is an item of 10.5 billion kilowatt-hours sold to Federal resale. Most of this energy goes to Bonneville Power Administration for wholesale resale by it to its customers. This item, therefore, appears twice in the breakdown, both under the Bureau of Reclamation and as energy sold by Bonneville to its various customers. This also means that the total indicated sales of federally financed power projects is appreciably greater than total generation, due to power sold twice.

PRICES PAID BY COMPANIES

The breakdown of TVA sales to power companies during fiscal 1950 and rates is as follows:

Company	Energy purchased (million kilowatt-hours)	Rate (mills per kilowatt-hour)
Appalachian Electric Power.....	40.6	11.71
Arkansas Power & Light.....	26.1	2.88
Bells Light & Water.....	2.9	5.55
Franklin Power & Light.....	12.1	5.05
Kentucky Utilities.....	77.3	10.77
Southern Services.....	411.7	8.63
Tennessee Light & Power.....	1.5	6.00

Bonneville sales were made to private companies at an average rate of 2.41 mills as follows:

Company	Energy purchased (million kilowatt-hours)
Mountain States Power.....	143
Pacific Power & Light.....	71
Portland General Electric.....	1,083
Puget Sound Power & Light.....	576
Washington Water Power.....	116
Walla Walla Power—Pacific Power & Light companies.....	838
6-company Northwest power pool.....	481

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I believe Senators should know exactly how the amendment reads. It is as follows:

Page 18, line 21, after the figure "\$208,635,450" add the following: "which shall include and provide for the construction of transmission lines in the Bureau of Reclamation regions 6 and 7, including western Minnesota."

The amendment does not pretend to say how much money shall be taken from other projects which are involved.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I have only 2 minutes, and the Senator from Minnesota has had a great deal of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. CASE. Twice, by yea-and-nay vote, the Senate has this afternoon approved a total figure of \$208,000,000 for projects embraced in the budget estimates and in the presentation of the committee. To include now something which the Senate committee considered and did not include would mean that we would be making a blanket pickup from wherever the Department of the Interior might want to make it from any of the projects heretofore approved.

There was a sound reason for advancing construction in North Dakota and South Dakota, from a rural standpoint, and that is that in both those States hundreds of thousands of acres are being taken out of cultivation and away from the farmers of the State to provide for reservoir sites, the basins and lakes that will be flooded by the river. There is a direct loss in assessed valuations in those States.

The REA's immediately adjacent had a natural expectation that they would get some consideration. Furthermore, there was no program whatever by private power companies to provide transmission lines. I understand that at the present time the Northern States Power Co. has a definite program that is put forward to provide transmission lines. There was nothing like that in North Dakota or South Dakota when the construction was started. The power will not be available until 1954.

At this time, with the limited amount of information there is before the Senate, without knowing how much money will be taken and from whom it will be taken, we should not adopt the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I will divide the time under my control between the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], allotting 2 minutes to each.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to address myself particularly to the junior Senator from Minnesota. At the outset of his remarks it was made to appear that all that was involved in the amendment was about \$7,000,000, although there was no increase of the amount in the bill. The fact of the matter is that this is the first step of a program that is to cost \$29,000,000, instead of \$7,000,000, and in some future time the sponsors will be coming back for the other \$22,000,000. I think that is the first thing the Senate ought to bear in mind.

Secondly, I may say I have had something to do with the subject, because in years gone by I investigated the REA situation in Minnesota rather thoroughly, and I point out that the facilities existing there now are reasonably adequate so far as power is concerned, and I believe the junior Senator from Minnesota has admitted that. In other words, it is said there is about a 17 percent reserve, and that reserve is equal to the whole power consumption of the 24 REA cooperatives that are on the lines at the present time.

The next thing to bear in mind is that the power facilities there are serving some 450 units retail, and one hundred

and-fifteen-odd by wholesale. There is a reasonably good coverage.

The fourth thing to keep in mind is that the future power generation, of course, will be adequate to needs, because if I understand the program that is now in effect, it calls for an expenditure of nearly \$500,000,000 between now and 1956 for power generation.

Finally, with respect to service, \$150,000,000 was spent on line in the last 4 years. Thirty-five million dollars is being spent this year, and it is proposed to spend another \$150,000,000 in the next 2 years. In other words, the lines keep up with the needs for power pretty well.

It is rather astonishing, in view of what seems to be a persuasive plea by the junior Senator from Minnesota, that the proposal was never addressed to the Budget Bureau, because nothing appears in the bill by way of a budget draft. Secondly, if the matter was presented to the House, it certainly was not persuasively done. It did not convince the House. I understand that a Member of the House from Minnesota asked for a million dollars and the House refused to grant it.

Now the Senate committee refuses to include anything. The Budget Bureau is against the proposal. Evidently the House of Representatives is against it. The Senate committee which heard the testimony is against it. I see no warrant for following the very persuasive and, shall I say, passionate plea the junior Senator from Minnesota has made for this item, because it involves \$7,000,000 in the immediate days ahead, but the whole program calls for \$29,000,000, and it is simply going to develop our budget disparity that much more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. My time is up, I am afraid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes remain under the control of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. The Chair understands the Senator from Arizona has allotted the 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if I can have a minute I shall be glad to yield it to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HAYDEN. Very well, I yield a minute to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I appreciate the moving testimony the Senator from Illinois has given. Now that he has told us about the power surplus, will he be good enough to tell me and the Senate the amount of power surplus that exists in the areas served by the 16 REA's? I know there is power surplus in Minneapolis. I know there is power surplus in Winona. But how much power surplus is there at Worthington, Minn.? How much power surplus is there at Benson, Minn.? I should like to know where the power surplus is which it is said exists in the REA areas.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Northern States Power Co., I understand, serves an area

of about 40,000 square miles. I do not have the slightest doubt that in the nature of things every once in a while there is an overload on the system, or there is a maldistribution of power. But the fact of the matter is that the facilities and transmission program and generation program are going forward under a taxable instrumentality, and, given a little while, I think we will catch up with the need.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. **CORDON**. Mr. President, I understand there is 1 minute remaining of the time under the control of the Senator from Arizona, and that the remaining time has been allotted to me.

I simply rise in opposition to the amendment on two major bases. No. 1, it violates one of the basic concepts of the policy which has prevailed in the Senate since the power question has been before the Congress, namely, that the Interior Department should negotiate wheeling contracts where they can, and construct transmission lines only as an alternative when reasonable wheeling contracts cannot be negotiated. In this instance that has not been done. No negotiation has been had. Their offers are only offers, and the reason why they are only offers is that the other side has perhaps been unwilling to consider them; at least it has not considered them. I do not know about the unwillingness.

No. 2. The dams will not be completed for some 3 years, so time is not of the essence in this question. There is adequate time for a full consideration by the Bureau of the Budget and for the Senate itself, through its committees, to go into the matter in an orderly way at the right time, without prejudice to anybody or favoritism to anybody.

Mr. President, I ask that the committee's position be upheld.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. **HUMPHREY**] to insert in the committee amendment on page 18, line 21, after the figures "\$268,535,450", the following: "which shall include and provide for construction of transmission lines in the Bureau of Reclamation Regions 6 and 7 including western Minnesota, and."

Mr. **CORDON**. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. All in favor of the amendment will rise and stand until counted.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **HUNT**. Mr. President, I wish to be recognized immediately after the announcement of the result.

The roll call was resumed and concluded.

Mr. **JOHNSON** of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. **ANDERSON**], the Senator from Connecti-

cut [Mr. **BENTON**], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. **CLEMENTS**], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. **JOHNSON**], the Senator from New York [Mr. **LEHMAN**], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. **MAYBANK**] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. **CONNALLY**] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. **GILLETTE**], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. **GREEN**], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. **McMAHON**], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. **SPARKMAN**] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. **McCARRAN**] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. **MURRAY**] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. **SMATHERS**] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. **SMITH**] is absent on official committee business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. **MAYBANK**] would vote "nay."

Mr. **SALTONSTALL**. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. **BREWSTER**], who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations has a general pair on this vote with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. **McMAHON**].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. **FLANDERS**] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. **JENNER**] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. **HICKENLOOPER**], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. **SMITH**], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. **WILEY**] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. **SMITH**] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. **MARTIN**] is absent by leave of the Senate. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. **MALONE**] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. **TOBEY**] is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation, and if present he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. **DUFF**] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. **WELKER**] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—15

Douglas	Kefauver	McFarland
Hill	Kerr	Monroney
Humphrey	Kilgore	Moody
Hunt	Long	Morse
Johnson, Tex.	Magnuson	Neely

NAYS—55

Aiken	Cain	Dworshak
Bennett	Capehart	Eastland
Bricker	Carlson	Eaton
Bridges	Case	Ellender
Butler, Md.	Chavez	Ferguson
Butler, Nebr.	Cordon	Frear
Byrd	Dirksen	Fulbright

George	McCarthy	Schoeppel
Hayden	McClellan	Smith, Maine
Hendrickson	McKellar	Stennis
Hennings	Millikin	Taft
Hoey	Mundt	Thye
Holland	Nixon	Underwood
Ives	O'Connor	Watkins
Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney	Wherry
Kem	Pastore	Williams
Knowland	Robertson	Young
Langer	Russell	
Lodge	Saltonstall	

NOT VOTING—26

Anderson	Hickenlooper	Murray
Benton	Jenner	Smathers
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. J.
Clements	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Connally	Malone	Sparkman
Duff	Martin	Tobey
Flanders	Maybank	Welker
Gillette	McCarran	Wiley
Green	McMahon	

So Mr. **HUMPHREY**'s amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. **MAGNUSON** and Mr. **HUNT** addressed the Chair.

Mr. **HAYDEN**. Mr. President, before the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming or that of the Senator from Washington is offered, the committee amendment on page 18, beginning in line 21, as amended, must be disposed of. It is a formal matter, but it should be disposed of before we undertake to consider any further amendments.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 18, beginning in line 21, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. Mr. President—

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK**. On page 18—

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. Mr. President—

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Will the Senator allow the clerk to state the next committee amendment passed over?

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. I have an amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Certain committee amendments have been previously passed over.

The next committee amendment passed over was, on page 18, line 23, after the word "which", to strike out "\$29,202,200" and insert in lieu thereof, "\$28,972,650."

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

The next committee amendment passed over was, on page 18, line 24, to strike out "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers" and insert "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been

heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities which the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer: *Provided further*, That in order to promote agreement among the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado, and to avoid any possible alteration of existing vested water rights, no part of this or of any prior appropriation shall be used for construction or for further commitment for construction of the Glendo unit or any feature thereof, until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado, and approved by Congress: *Provided further*, That no part of this or prior appropriations shall be used for construction, nor for further commitments to construction of Moorhead Dam and Reservoir, Mont., or any feature thereof until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of Wyoming and Montana, and approved by the Congress."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have an amendment to offer to the committee amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I asked for recognition to propose an amendment at the proper place in the bill, at page 18. The clerk read another amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. These are committee amendments which have been passed over heretofore.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment before the committee amendment is acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be recognized for that purpose. The Senator from South Dakota has already sent one amendment to the desk.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 19, at the beginning of line 4, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "of this appropriation" and insert "of the appropriations in this act."

Mr. CASE. The subject immediately before the Senate is what has been identified in the press and in much discussion as the so-called Keating amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator state again to what page his proposed amendment applies?

Mr. CASE. At page 19, line 4. The so-called Keating amendment is shown in lines 24 and 25 at page 18, and in lines 1, 2, and 3 on page 19. The Keating amendment reads:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to

Federal establishments and preferred customers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend. It is impossible for a Senator to speak, or for his colleagues to understand him, unless the Senate is in order. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As I understand, the Senator from South Dakota is offering an amendment on page 19. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] and I have separate amendments to propose on page 18. I wonder whether we are proceeding in order. I sought recognition on several occasions, but the Chair stated that there were committee amendments which had been passed over, and the Chair then recognized the Senator from South Dakota in order to present his amendment on page 19. I wonder whether the present procedure will preclude us from offering our amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is offering an amendment to the pending committee amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is what we are trying to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington proposes to offer an amendment to the text of the bill. His amendment will be in order after the committee amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. MAGNUSON. My parliamentary inquiry is whether, since we are now dealing with page 19, the Senator from Wyoming and I will be foreclosed from offering our amendments on page 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Of course not. The amendment before the Senate is an amendment to a committee amendment. The amendment of the Senator from Washington is an amendment to the bill.

Mr. HUNT. I make the same inquiry with respect to my proposed amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be in order a little later.

Mr. CASE. The committee amendment strikes out the House provision which I have read, and inserts another proviso. My amendment is an amendment to the proviso which is proposed to be substituted by the committee amendment. The committee amendment takes the language of the Keating amendment, makes no change in it up to the last word "customers," but adds the following words, "except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities which the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer."

Mr. President, I may say at the outset that I believe the additional words

provided by the committee are definitely an improvement on the original Keating amendment, because they recognize the realities of the situation, namely, that there are some instances in which funds have been heretofore appropriated for transmission lines now under construction, the completion of which should be permitted as a practical matter, and in which the substations are necessary. Therefore, the exceptions which the committee has suggested are decidedly in order. However, the whole Keating amendment, as adopted by the House and as here presented, applies only to funds of the Bureau of Reclamation. That is, it says that hereafter funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation shall not be used "to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts," with the exceptions mentioned. The Keating amendment applies only to the funds of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The amendment which I have offered would change the words in line 4 on page 19, which limit the application of the proviso to the Bureau of Reclamation, and would make them applicable to other construction funds appropriated in the bill.

In other words, if it is a sound proposition to establish the principle for transmission lines constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation, it is a sound principle to establish it for the Southwestern Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, Bonneville, and any other place where money is provided by the Federal Government for the construction of transmission lines. What is sauce for the Bureau of Reclamation transmission lines should also be sauce for the Southwestern Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, and Bonneville. That is all that my amendment would accomplish.

If anything could be accomplished by withholding consideration of my amendment at this time for the purpose of considering the amendment to be proposed by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], I would have no objection to doing so. I understand the Senator from Wyoming wishes to change the definition of the exceptions. Even with the definition changed it seems to me that the principle should apply to the country as a whole. Why pick out the Bureau of Reclamation and say to them, "When you build transmission lines you shall not build them where you have wheeling contracts, but we will permit Bonneville to build them, we will permit the Southwestern Power Administration to build them, and we will permit the Southeastern Power Administration to build them, where they have wheeling contracts." Why place such a limitation upon the Bureau of Reclamation? It seems to me that the logic of the situation would call for the establishment of such a principle for the whole country, and not for only the Bureau of Reclamation. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask the Senator from South Dakota whether it is feasible to adopt such a policy at all. Why enlarge upon it? Bonneville has built all kinds of transmission lines in situations where they had wheeling contracts. Occasionally it must be done for various reasons.

Mr. CASE. The Bureau of Reclamation is operating in territory very similar to the Bonneville territory, in Idaho and other Western States.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not believe it is similar at all. If it is necessary to have a national policy, it should be the same for the whole country, but why adopt the Keating amendment at all?

Mr. CASE. Of course, the Senator from Washington may offer an amendment to strike out the Keating amendment. I say that if it should be applied at all, it should be applied to all, not to one.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the advice of my attorney on this subject. We have a very good attorney, I may say. What does the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] think of the proposal made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

Mr. CORDON. I appreciate my new appointment. The Senator from Oregon rather doubts the wisdom of changing the language in the committee amendment and broadening it to cover operations in established agencies. For instance, we have the Southwestern Power Administration. While it is true that it is an executive agency, it is nevertheless well established, and over a period of years, after a great many difficulties, we are beginning to see some light by way of logical operation.

I do not know that the change would injuriously affect operations already begun in the Southwest. Of course, it could not affect the Southeastern Power Administration, because they have not yet started operations. It could affect the Southwestern Power Administration. There is a possibility that the language might reach as far as the Bonneville Administration. There we have a complete operation under a separate statute, which not only authorizes the building of the lines, but directs that they be built. There can be no question about that. It is a mandate. I do not believe that the language would affect Bonneville, because of that special act, but there is just enough of a question that whatever good might come from a change is overshadowed by the doubts that arise.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on advice of counsel I shall adopt the old maxim: When in doubt, vote "no." Therefore I cannot support the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. May I suggest that the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], doctored up the Keating amendment to the point where they thought it would be all right to apply it to the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau of Reclamation has

been building transmission lines for a long time. The Senators have doctored up the Keating amendment to say that it is all right to apply the principle to transmission facilities "except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities which the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer."

If the Keating amendment was doctored up by making those exceptions, so that it would be fair and proper and practical as applied to the Central Valley project and other projects, and if those exceptions would take care of those situations, why should not exceptions be made to take care of the Bonneville Administration or the Southwestern Power Administration or the Southeastern Power Administration? The committee has made those exceptions and has doctored up the Keating amendment so that it is now all right for the Bureau of Reclamation. However, those exceptions do not take care of the other situations.

It seems to me that if this medicine has been prepared to care for special situations in respect to the application of the Keating amendment to the Bureau of Reclamation, the same medicine should be equally applicable to other situations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment on page 19, in line 4.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield time to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to take a few minutes to discuss the amendment submitted by the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment.

I think it is in accord with the policy the Senate has had for a number of years to require that the customers of the Department of the Interior in areas where the operations are not conducted under a special statute, as in the case of the Bonneville area, secure wheeling contracts, in an attempt to get the service performed by an existing facility or agency and to obtain the service under those contracts at reasonable rates. If that can be done, I think it is reasonable to assume that the contracting agency will proceed to wheel the power and deliver it.

If we can go that far, then I think we should also have the right to assume that the Department of the Interior would not request the appropriation of funds with which to build competing or duplicating lines in an area where it already has made a contract to have all its power delivered by an existing agency or facility, and without the investment of Government capital.

Unfortunately, there have come before the committee one request after another to do that very thing, namely, to build

duplicating lines, which the Department has found to be unnecessary, and for which it has refused to request funds. That was the case this year. There was an attempt to request funds for the construction of such competing or duplicating lines, but an opportunity to make that request was not even provided. Nevertheless, there was a desire to request funds for the construction of competing lines.

The Keating amendment was intended to be a statutory declaration of policy which would be exactly in line with the policy the Senate has already accepted and adopted. However, the language of the Keating amendment went far beyond the intent of the Keating amendment; and the application of the language of that amendment to the conditions which existed made it clear to the committee that the prohibition would substantially hog-tie the Department of Agriculture, so far as giving it any right of action at all, even by way of building a main line for a connection with one of its dams. A dozen illustrations were before us. The committee attempted to meet the objections which were raised with reference to the lack of practicability of the Keating amendment, while at the same time retaining its philosophy.

That is why, as the Senator from South Dakota has said, the committee, acting for the Senate, attempted to tailor the language of the Keating amendment. The committee intended to do that, and to do nothing more than that. The intent was to make applicable an already existing Senate philosophy, and to leave for the Department the adequate flexibility which the committee felt the Department must have if it was to do the job which the Congress had directed it to do.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I shall be happy to yield in a moment.

First, Mr. President, let me say that I think I have discussed this particular amendment about as fully as I need to.

I merely wish to add that the language of the Keating amendment as it came to us went only to the transmission lines in the areas to which the appropriation to which the Keating amendment was attached as a proviso went, and those areas were outside the areas where, by an executive or administrative officer, a power administration had been set up, or the area where the Bonneville Administration had been set up by statute.

There was an area where nothing had been done in the matter of policy, and the Keating amendment applied to it. Consequently, our amendments applied to it, and our committee did not consider the terms of the Keating amendment to be such as to apply it beyond the appropriation to which it was attached.

Now I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Senator certainly would not want to advocate that duplicating lines should be permitted at Bonneville, nor does the Senator wish to argue that the Government should appropriate money with which to build duplicating lines for the South-

western Power Administration. Is not that correct?

Mr. CORDON. So far as I am concerned, I do not want duplicating lines built anywhere. I am endeavoring to call attention to the doubts which would arise under the Senator's amendment.

As to the Bonneville Administration, I have no objection at all. In the first place, I do not believe the amendment can affect the Bonneville Administration, because it operates under a special statute. In the second place, there was no wheeling agreement there; the agreement was a power-pooling agreement. In the third place, all the authority that is needed has been provided after full consideration of all the parties, both public and private, in order to assure all that is necessary for the complete operation of the full system. The private parties appeared before the committee, in connection with the representatives of the Bonneville Administration, and made their request. So there is no case there.

I do not know what would happen in the case of the Southwestern Power Administration or in the case of the Central Valley.

Mr. CASE. The committee thought that in providing for the exceptions, it was taking care of any special situations, did it not?

Mr. CORDON. It took care of the language of the Keating amendment, as applying to a situation where no policies were evolved.

Mr. CASE. In other words, as applying to the Bureau of Reclamation?

Mr. CORDON. Yes; as applying to the Bureau of Reclamation, in connection with this fund.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. First, I should like to say, in regard to the possibility of any irreparable injury because of the adoption of the Keating amendment, that I doubt that there would be such a possibility. So I do not think we would gain anything by adopting the Senator's amendment, in cases in which there is any doubt as to how the Keating amendment would apply as a legal proposition to these situations in the executive departments.

Now I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Insofar as the Central Valley is concerned, I think it is included in the amendment which has been offered, because those funds come out of the appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to ask a similar question. The amendment would apply to all other exceptions, and the Senator's amendment would apply to the Bonneville Administration. Does the Senator think the Keating amendment would supersede the Bonneville Administration statute, as it applies to contracts of such types?

Mr. CORDON. If it did supersede that statute, I would be willing to ac-

cept this amendment, insofar as the principle is involved. However, in my opinion, the Keating amendment would not supersede it, because the Bonneville Administration does not have wheeling agreements. It has power-pooling agreements, which are altogether different.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It could have wheeling agreements, could it not?

Mr. CORDON. Oh, yes; it could have any kind of agreement known to man; but it does not have.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In reference to the amendment offered to the committee amendment, by the able Senator from South Dakota, I wish to say that I shall have to oppose his amendment, for in my humble opinion, it would permit almost a monopoly on the part of some. I think we cannot determine whether a line now in existence will be adequate or inadequate to serve an area or community. If we decided that a certain line was adequate for that purpose, but if in fact it was, the amendment would constitute a barrier against the construction by another party or by the Bureau of Reclamation of a line which would serve the need and the purpose. Therefore, I shall vote against the amendment the Senator from South Dakota has offered to the committee amendment.

The Senator from Wyoming has an amendment which would clarify the language so as to avoid the possibility of any monopolistic tendencies on the part of any corporation, firm, or individual, so far as concerns the construction of transmission lines to provide adequate service to communities where current would be made available from an installation which the Government may have in a given area or may install there at a future time. Mr. President, the Senate should adopt the amendment of the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] in order to clarify and correct this language.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, may I inquire how much of my time remains?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then let us vote on the Case amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota has 8 minutes.

Mr. CASE. I do not care to use the 8 minutes, but I should like to use about 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona has 2 minutes remaining. The Chair was mistaken.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I should like to point out that I think the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] either did not hear the amendment read, or misunderstood it, because the language is already in the bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I was on the floor when the amendment was read, and I was on the floor when it was being explained, and I believe I understand the purpose of it.

Mr. CASE. Then I may say it is difficult to understand the Senator's words

and, perhaps, his misunderstanding. But I thought the Senator from Minnesota was talking about the necessity of the Bureau of Reclamation's taking care of special situations. The language is in the bill, and it applies to the Bureau of Reclamation now. The amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota neither takes away from nor adds to the Bureau of Reclamation. It merely says that, if this is sauce for the Bureau of Reclamation, it is also sauce for the other power administrations. If the Bureau of Reclamation needs some leeway in order to take care of special situations and to prevent monopoly, that is dealt with in other provisions of the committee amendment. It is not involved in the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota. The language already in the bill applies to the Bureau of Reclamation. If there are possibilities of monopoly under this language, they are neither affected by nor created by the amendment which the Senator from South Dakota has offered. The amendment simply proposes that these other power administrations shall work under the same provision under which the Bureau of Reclamation is being asked to operate. If it is good for the Bureau of Reclamation, it should be good for them. If it would not be good for them, it ought not to be applied to the Bureau of Reclamation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I have heard three objections to the amendment: No. 1, that it is confusing and that it would becloud the issue; No. 2, that Senators do not understand what it means; and, No. 3, that Senators have read it, clearly understand it, think it is bad, and are therefore against it. Mr. President, I want to say that I align myself with all three of those groups in opposition to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] to the committee amendment on page 19, line 4.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 19, line 11, after the word facilities, it is proposed to delete the word "which" and insert "in which the Secretary of the Interior finds."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have again consulted with my advisers on the committee, and on behalf of the committee I am glad to accept the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next amendment passed over.

The next amendment passed over was, under the subhead "Operation and Maintenance," on page 20, line 13, after the word "law", to strike out "\$15,094,000" and insert "\$16,168,594."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California offered an amendment to that, which has not been acted upon, and which therefore is pending.

Mr. HAYDEN. It should be acted on.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment was to reduce the amount in the committee amendment by \$191,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is involved a transfer of the same amount from this place to another place in the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. It was transferred, earlier today, to page 18, line 21. So this amendment to the amendment should be agreed to, reducing this amount by \$191,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 20, line 13, after the word "which", to strike out "not to exceed \$12,592,900" and insert "\$12,476,494."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on the same page, in line 15, after the word "and", to strike out "not to exceed \$1,671,000" and insert "\$1,862,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. That amendment should not be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is involved also in the \$191,000. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment passed over was, on the same page, in line 16, after the word "fund", to insert "and of which not to exceed \$10,331,434 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 26, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$1,684,000" and insert "\$2,783,000"; in line 5, after the word "be", to strike out "available for expenditure toward" and insert "expended for"; in line 8, after the word "that", to strike out "prior thereto contractual arrangements satisfactory to the Secretary shall be made for repayment of" and insert "any"; in line 10, after the word "sums," to insert "thereof"; in line 12, after the word "Coachella", to insert "Valley"; and in line 13, after the word "States", to insert "shall be repayable by said district to the United States unless said district shall be judicially determined to be not liable therefor."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, under the heading "Geological Survey—Surveys, investigations, and research," on page 27, line 16, after the word "activities", to strike out "\$21,900,000" and insert "\$21,300,000, of which not to exceed \$13,455,000 shall be available for personal services, and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, under the heading "Bureau of Mines—Conservation and development of mineral resources," on page 29, line 10, after the word "owners", to strike out "\$17,950,000" and insert "\$17,587,203, of which not to exceed \$10,639,175 shall be available for personal services."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire to call up my amendment "7-6-51-M," and I ask that it be read. It is an amendment to the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment it is proposed on page 29, line 11, to strike out "\$17,587,203" and insert "\$16,765,143," and on page 29, line 11, to strike out "\$10,639,175" and insert "\$10,359,775."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the programs for conservation and development of mineral resources, under the Bureau of Mines, include one project for which the committee specifically denied funds, and another, which is a corollary of a series of projects, the committee has turned down elsewhere in the bill.

The purpose of the amendment is to reduce the appropriation and to adjust the personal services limitation to correspond with the elimination of these two projects. The first project is for the operation of an aluminum extraction plant at Laramie, Wyo., which has not yet been constructed. The committee denied the \$750,000 requested for this purpose, but left the money in the bill, quite free to be used for other purposes. In other words, the \$750,000, in effect, now becomes free money to be used anywhere the Department may care to use it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is completely mistaken. The \$750,000 item is not in the bill. It was never presented to the committee by any member of the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan is not mistaken, and he will try to point out from the side-slips—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt again—

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire merely to state that a budget estimate was submitted to the House for \$750,000. The House did not adopt that budget estimate. It was not in the bill. It was not put into the bill by the Senate committee. No one in the committee moved its inclusion. The Senator from Michigan did not move that it be included,

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Arizona did not.

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Wyoming did not so move.

Mr. FERGUSON. But I want to show that it is in the figures.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is mistaken.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will turn to page 169 of the side-slips he will see, under the chart on that page, "b" under "2" "Minerals and metals," and under the "b" he will see "Nonferrous metals (Senate hearings, 139, budget estimate 'a,' \$3,657,000." The "a" refers to a footnote which says that the \$3,657,000 includes \$750,000, and refers to House Document 66.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Senator will refer to that, he will find it is for the operation of the Laramie plant.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. But will the Senator be good enough to look at the very column from which he is quoting? If he will look at the heading he will see that the heading of that column is "Budget estimate." If the Senator will look at the next column, which is entitled "House bill, 1952," he will see that the House bill appropriated not \$3,657,000, including House Document No. 66, but only \$2,907,000. Then he will see in the next column, which is headed "Restoration requested," that the Bureau of Mines requested the restoration. But no one in the committee supported that request. So that what we have before us is a Senate bill to which the money, \$750,000 eliminated by the House, was never restored.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me read from page 26 of the House report:

Conservation and development of mineral resources. The budget estimate for this appropriation is \$18,700,000, of which amount the House allowed \$17,950,000. Included in the \$18,700,000 is \$11,751,972 for personal services, of which \$624,000 is for operation and maintenance. The remaining personal service estimate amounts to \$11,127,972, to which the committee has applied a 10-percent reduction amount, or \$1,112,797 below the budget estimate. Deducting the \$1,112,797 from the budget estimate—

Which is the \$18,700,000, which has the \$750,000 in it—

leaves \$17,587,203, which amount is recommended by the committee for the fiscal year 1952. This amount is \$362,797 less than the appropriation approved by the House and, as indicated, it is \$1,112,797 less than the 1952 budget estimate. No part of the supplemental estimate of \$750,000 for operation of the proposed plant at Laramie, Wyo., was approved, inasmuch as the plant is not now in operation and will not be during the fiscal year 1952.

If the Senator from Michigan can understand the English language, it is clear that the \$750,000 is in the \$18,700,000, and that is the amount from which the deduction was made, and it is the amount which is left in the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the statement of the Senator can be adjusted as to the facts very simply. What the Senator started to say when he offered his amendment was that the \$750,000 was in the bill. It is not in the bill at any place. If the Senator says that the rule which the committee adopted was to figure out the reduction of personnel, then I say to him that the formula was based upon the budget, and of course he is correct so far as that is concerned. In other words, I want to make it crystal clear that the appropriation recommended by the committee, and which is now before the Senate, appears on page 29, line 11, and it amounts to \$17,587,203. The Senator from Michigan agrees to that, does he not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator repeat that statement?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. On page 29, line 11, the appropriation recommended by the committee is \$17,587,203.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And that is a reduction below the amount appropriated by the House, which was \$17,950,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The appropriation by the House of \$17,950,000, in turn, was exactly \$750,000 below the budget estimate, which was \$18,700,000. Does the Senator agree to that?

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me figure it out.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me point it out to the Senator. That is correct. If the Senator's amendment is designed to make a deeper personal-service cut, it should be based upon the fact that the rule which the committee adopted for figuring the 10-percent cut was to take, in every instance, the total budget estimate, and make a 10-percent cut below that. That was done in every single instance.

Mr. FERGUSON. And, therefore, it should be done in this instance.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was 10 percent below the budget.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is included the item of \$750,000—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not want to discuss the merits of the question with the Senator at the moment. I merely want to make clear what the rule was which the committee followed. The rule was that the committee took the budget estimate, whether it allowed the budget estimate or not, and cut 10 percent below it. If I remember correctly, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Cordon] was the author of the formula. It has been applied without discrimination everywhere throughout the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this comes under a different rule, because the \$750,000 was not in the original budget. It is in a supplemental budget. The rule adopted provided a cut of 10 percent from the original budget. That is why I have been arguing that the \$750,000 is in the bill, and should not be in it when the 10-percent cut is applied.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say that the supplemental budget was before the House before the House acted upon the bill. It was there before either the

House committee or the Senate committee acted upon the bill. Therefore, in the judgment of the full committee, it should be in the norm from which the 10-percent reduction should be made. Now if the Senator changes it and makes a deeper cut, he will be making a deeper personnel cut on this item of the Bureau of Mines than on any other item.

I want to say to the Senate that I am really concerned about this matter. I have on my desk the report of Mr. Wilson, head of War Mobilization. He tells me of the minerals which are needed, copper, lead, zinc, and of substitutes, and that all over the country we are looking for these substitutes. It will be the personnel of the Bureau of Mines who will help to find such substitutes. I think the Senator would do well to forget even the 10-percent cut in the case of the Bureau of Mines, but, of course, I am not going to propose that. I do feel, however, that we should not make the additional cut in personnel which is really the effect of the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, it is clear to the Senator from Michigan that the deduction was not made from the \$18,700,000, and therefore if we use the figures from the report, the amount should be reduced by the \$750,000.

There is a second item involved. The second project is for mineral surveys in New York and New England in the amount of \$100,000. These surveys are a part of a widespread survey project which has been planned for the area under auspices of various other agencies dealing with power, parks, and fish and wildlife. Each of the other phases of the project was denied by the committee, and it is only consistent that this phase should be eliminated as well.

The reduction in the appropriation under this amendment does not total \$850,000, which is the sum of the Budget requests for these two projects, because they have been subjected to a 10-percent personal-service cut by committee action. As a result, it is not necessary to repeat that cut, and the net reduction amounts to \$822,060, with a corresponding adjustment in the personal-service limitation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But what I wish to point out to the Senator is that the amendment which he has had printed undertakes to make a cut in line 11. The committee cut below the House figure, from \$17,950,000 to \$17,587,000. Now the Senator in his amendment wants to cut that to \$16,765,143. By that additional cut, which is apparently directed at \$750,000 which is not in the bill, he will be cutting activities in the field of synthetic fuels, he will be cutting all sorts of other operations of the Bureau of Mines, all to the serious detriment of the defense effort. If the Senator were to confine his amendment to the question of personnel, it then would be purely an arithmetical computation, but so far as his first amendment is concerned, it is utterly against the public interest.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield some time to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. I freely confess that I am a bit confused at the minute. I am not at all clear in my own mind as to what are the facts. I am inclined at the minute to believe that they are on the side of the Senator from Michigan. I would hope that at this time, if it is satisfactory to the majority, we might recess over the evening. I believe that if there is \$750,000 in hard money that was not intended to be in the bill, and that it can, after a thorough study, be eliminated tomorrow, it would pay for the hour or two we otherwise might be in session. I do not know that the amount is in the bill, but I am inclined to believe it is. If it is not, I want to stand by the committee. If it is in the bill, I want it to come out.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask unanimous consent that this particular amendment be passed over at this time, and that I may bring it up at the close of consideration of the bill. I, too, want to study the matter with the Senator from Oregon. As I see it today, the situation is as I have stated it to be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the amendment be passed over until other features of the bill have been disposed of.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I want to say that it is perfectly beyond my capacity to understand how the Senator from Michigan entertains the slightest thought that \$750,000 for this purpose is in the bill. It was denied by the House, and the budget estimate in this supplemental document was never added in the Senate. All in the world it is necessary to do is to refer to the very side-slip to which the Senator from Michigan referred, page 169, and there there appear four columns.

The first of these columns is entitled "Appropriated 1951." The second column is entitled "Budget estimate, 1952." The third column is headed "House bill 1952." The fourth column is headed "Restoration requested."

Under the item "Nonferrous metals" a year ago, in 1951, there was appropriated \$2,672,258, as shown in the column entitled "Appropriated 1951." In the second column, entitled "Budget estimate, 1952," the figure is "\$3,657,000," and with a note "a," which the Senator from Michigan read as follows: "Includes \$750,000 in House Document 63." But we see that in the third column, which tells what the House did, the figure is not \$3,657,000, but \$750,000 less, namely, \$2,907,000. And then in the fourth column, under the heading "Restoration requested," we see that the Bureau of Mines wanted it back, but we did not put it back. So it is not in the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan tried to explain this to the Senator from Wyoming off the floor a day or two ago. I thought I convinced him.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator convinced me that if he wants to change the base of computation on the personnel reduction, of course, he could argue for or against the reduction. But what

the Senator is now moving is not what he discussed with the Senator from Wyoming off the floor, but a further reduction of \$750,000 in the basic appropriation, which I think would be against the public interest.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask what is the effect of the paragraph in the report on page 27, which reads as follows:

No part of the supplemental estimate of \$750,000 for operation of the proposed plant at Laramie, Wyo., was approved inasmuch as this plant is not now in operation and will not be during the fiscal year 1952.

Mr. FERGUSON. The committee took out the language, but never took out the appropriation in fact. That is what the Senator from Michigan desired to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has made a unanimous-consent request. Is there objection?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to make inquiry as to how many more amendments there are. I had hoped that we could finish the bill today, so that we could take all day tomorrow for committee work and go over until Monday. How many more amendments are there?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have just conferred with the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] who is the ranking minority member of the committee, and I have also talked with the distinguished Senator from Michigan. There are several more amendments. There is a time limitation. The junior Senator from Nebraska objected to extending the consideration of one amendment for an hour today, in order that we might finish. However, I believe that we would save time if we were to take a recess until tomorrow.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am not objecting to that, if we cannot finish tonight. How long will it require tomorrow?

Mr. WHERRY. Unless other amendments are offered, I understand that there are three more amendments. I do not know whether there are any more on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. WATKINS. I have one amendment which I may present.

Mr. WHERRY. There are about three or four amendments on this side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not know that a unanimous-consent agreement is necessary, if we are to suspend now.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan withdraws his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I inquire, what is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that there are 8 minutes left, to be divided equally between the

proponents and the opponents of the pending amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if we are through with the consideration of the bill today, I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not wish to be in the position of having the majority leader farm out the time. I shall take only about 5 minutes.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is all right. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nebraska have 5 minutes, without its being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on the vote on the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], seeking an appropriation for eight new reclamation projects, the Senator from Nebraska voted "yea." There is quite a long history in connection with that vote. I have endeavored to stay with the committee on all the committee amendments. I shall not go into detail, and I shall not go into the votes in committee. However, I voted for those projects, first, because I had made a commitment, as long as 8 years ago, to the so-called Sergeant project, in the semiarid district of Nebraska. I feel now, as I did then, that it is a very worthy project. While it was hooked onto other projects, I could not afford to have my commitment to the people there misunderstood. They are anxious to have that irrigation project started.

I voted for it for a second reason. Some Senators who have been offering amendments to reduce or deny appropriations for irrigation projects at home have gone all the way in voting for similar projects not only in ECA countries, but in remote areas of the world. This afternoon, in the 2 minutes' time allotted me, I quoted from a brief statement by a man who is in charge of the ECA reclamation program in Italy. The statement showed what we have done in Italy, and have done continuously during the past 3 years. Some Senators have been offering amendments to reduce or deny appropriations for reclamation and irrigation projects at home, and at the same time voting 100 percent for similar projects in Italy, in Portugal, in Africa, in Belgian Congo.

Let us take the case of Italy. I have before me a copy of Reclamation Era for July 1951, which is an official publication, an official document. In this document there is an article—

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it not an official document of the Bureau of Reclamation?

Mr. WHERRY. It is an official document of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. WATKINS. Is not the writer also one of the men whom we loaned to the ECA?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. He is a recognized expert on reclamation. He is in charge of that ECA program in Italy.

This article shows what is being done in Italy. Time does not permit me to read the article in full. Later I shall

ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

The author of this article is Mr. W. E. Corfitzen, reclamation specialist of the Economic Cooperation Administration, in Rome, Italy. He speaks of \$600,000,000 of ECA funds having been allocated to Italy in 1948-49; of course, that total is much more now, and he refers to \$300,000,000 as specifically available for reclamation:

To spend this sum for the rapid improvement of the national economy, the Italian Government prepared a budget with the advice and assistance of the ECA mission. Seventy billion lire was allocated to agriculture—about \$117,000,000. Of this amount, \$70,000,000 was allocated for reclamation projects.

Mr. President, I wonder if we may have order. If Senators wish to settle the question of the \$750,000, I wish they would settle it in their time, and not in mine. I should like to have these 5 minutes, if I may. I realize that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is having a very difficult time making the Senator from Michigan see the pending amendment exactly as he sees it. I know that they will get together. If they will permit me, I should like to finish these observations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair requests Senators to listen to the very interesting observations of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to intervene?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I compliment the Senator from Nebraska, because this is the first time I ever heard a Presiding Officer of this body ask the Senate to listen to anyone. I hope he will put it in his biography.

Mr. WHERRY. I will. I thank the Senator very much, indeed. I will also place in the biography the very gracious remarks of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. President, I wonder if I may have another 3 minutes? Other Senators have taken much of my time.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no objection.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, everyone is so agreeable that I think something must have gone wrong. I appreciate very much the splendid cooperation.

Recurring to the figure \$117,000,000—

Of this amount, \$70,000,000 was allocated for reclamation projects. This program envisaged a total expenditure for reclamation projects of about \$300,000,000 during the period of ECA assistance (until July 1, 1952).

Time does not permit me to give all the details of the program. ECA funds to Italy began in 1948. Three hundred million dollars is scheduled to be spent for reclamation projects by the end of the fiscal year 1952. They got together and decided that there were three programs which they should have. I read further from the article. This is the Director speaking:

Preliminary examination revealed that the reclamation program in Italy involved considerably more than new reclamation programs in the United States. In the United States, generally, flood control, drainage,

irrigation and incidental power developments are included, while the Italian program includes not only these aspects but also many others which would be required to develop land from a raw state to a fully going concern. Such features are highways, farm centers (including churches, schools, post and telegraph offices, police stations, and other civil services), farm buildings, transmission lines, etc.

They are all included in this particular scheme of reclamation in Italy, for which the taxpayers of the United States are paying.

Another essential difference in the two programs is that in the United States, water user's organizations, in general, must repay to the Federal Government the cost of reclamation works over a 40-year period without interest.

In other words, the projects which we justify in the United States are reimbursable projects. Not only do they create new wealth, but the money provided for their construction is paid back to the Government of the United States.

The Italian program is based upon the premise that reclamation works are a national benefit and that the cost will be repaid the Government through taxes on the lands developed.

None of the money comes back to the United States. The Italian people must repay their government out of wealth created in future years, but the Italian Government gets the \$300,000,000 in ECA funds for reclamation, as a gift from the United States.

Under the Italian law the government contributes 87.5 percent of the cost of reclamation features to southern projects and 75 percent to northern projects, with local interests contributing 12.5 and 25 percent respectively.

That does not involve any matching proposition. Yet it is said to be a matter of matching American dollars with Italian lire. The local interests contribute 12.5 and 25 percent respectively. That is their contribution. That is all they contribute.

The Government's share is paid by the direct gifts of ECA funds.

In the case of major features, such as construction of dams or river regulation, the Government pays the entire cost.

That is the reason I voted for the eight new reclamation projects. In opposing them, the Senator from Illinois gave as his reason the necessity for cutting non-defense expenditures, and therefore we should not make these new starts in the United States today. However, he has voted again and again to support such projects as the broad ECA reclamation program in Italy, and everywhere else we have undertaken to underwrite economic rehabilitation in the world. Unless he changes his procedure he will vote to support them again this year.

If we are going to continue to take money from our taxpayers to develop areas, cities, water systems, and everything else in Italy, I believe it is about time that we should protect and that we are justified in protecting the economy of the United States of America, so that we may bring into existence new wealth upon which our future generations can draw. These are reimburs-

able projects which are in the interest of the national defense.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I compliment the Senator from Nebraska on making a very informative and impressive speech. I hope that his observations will be heeded very carefully by the Senate. The \$300,000,000 he mentioned is being appropriated and being spent. He has referred only to the situation in Italy. However, under the ECA program and under the point 4 program, what is being done in Italy by way of reclamation projects is also being done or being planned to be done in other countries on other continents. If we are going to do it—and we are already under way with that program—the only way we can possibly hope to escape national insolvency is to expand our tax base. That means voting for projects such as covered by the Hayden amendment. Unfortunately, the amendment was rejected. It means voting for projects such as are contained in the civil-functions bill for flood control and power projects, which unfortunately the House has eliminated. We must somehow or other develop new productivity and new sources of wealth in order to carry on such programs in foreign countries.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his remarks. I am having one of my research assistants prepare a breakdown for all countries. I believe there are numerous reclamation and development projects in 19 or 20 foreign countries which are receiving ECA funds; not including their overseas territories, and the far-east programs. When the information has been assembled, I shall ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Record, either tomorrow or next week. What we are giving away in Italy and elsewhere in the world we are denying to our own people at home. We are cutting such projects at home which are in the interest of our national defense, and at the same time are providing from 75 to 100 percent of the money for similar projects in foreign countries.

Mr. MUNDT. The information which the Senator from Nebraska mentions should be of great interest to every Senator. We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars for reclamation, flood control, and other projects all over the world, and denying the same type of projects to our own people, when with such projects we could create new wealth and assure greater productivity in our own country.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I wish to compliment the Senator from Nebraska for his fine statement. I read the article from which he has quoted. I am happy that he has placed most of it in the Record. I invite the Senator's attention to some facts which have recently come to my attention and which I have verified. The ECA has reported that it is now spending its funds to permit European countries

to get \$440,000,000 worth of tobacco. It is really more of a gift than a loan. Recently they increased the buying power of Germany under the ECA plan so as to permit Germany to buy \$10,000,000 worth of tobacco, to be added to the \$5,000,000 which they had authorized for this year.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator from Nebraska recognize any Senators who voted against the Hayden amendment who were very enthusiastic about the ECA's program in that respect?

Mr. WHERRY. I not only recognize some of the Senators, but I had a conversation with one of them in the presence of the Senator from Utah, in which that particular question was brought up. I will say to the Senator from Utah that it seems to me that we should not turn down a project that is reimbursable, and thus prevent the bringing of arid land into productivity. I am thinking of that rich black land in Nebraska, with water flowing on it. That it is much more important to the productivity of this country and our national economy than an outright gift of \$440,000,000 worth of tobacco, to ECA recipient nations.

Mr. WATKINS. Is the Senator aware of the fact that among the projects in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona there were some which were deemed to be in the interest of national defense and had a direct relationship to our defense effort?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. The Senator from South Dakota just mentioned the civil functions bill. One of the projects proposed in that bill was turned down because it was said to be a new start. I refer to Gavin Point. If we are to get power at Fort Randall Dam, we must have the Gavin Point project constructed. Unless Gavin Point is constructed, it will reduce the efficiency of the Fort Randall Dam by 40 percent. It seems to me that we should not act on projects of this kind in a hit-and-miss manner. No program is worth while if it is conducted on that kind of basis.

Inasmuch as the Senator from Utah has brought up the point, I will say yes to his question. There are other projects which are coming up in the civil functions bill which are just as important.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator has mentioned Gavin Point. That project can be completed at an infinitesimal part of the cost of the reclamation project which this country is financing in Italy alone, to say nothing of the other projects scattered all over the globe, which the American taxpayer is asked to pay for. The place to start is in our own country, so as to create the wealth to underwrite a foreign-aid program.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I invite the Senator's attention to the Utah project among the eight State projects. The Utah project was authorized by Congress, and the planning has gone ahead. It is almost to the point where it can be finished. The project proposes to provide additional municipal water for 14 cities and towns in Davis and Weber Counties in Utah, where in the past 10 years we have had an in-

crease in population of 118 percent by reason of defense installations. We have reached the limit in the case of the water supply for domestic uses. Even though we have had some good years recently, droughts do occur in cycles, and if we had a drought many people would have to be moved away from the areas because we could not supply them with water. It is not a question of supplying water for irrigation projects, but for the people living there and for the protection of Hill Field and other defense installations which have increased the population by nearly 118 percent.

Mr. WHERRY. Something must be done in order to correct the situation.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I, too, wish to compliment the distinguished minority leader on the fine remarks he has made this afternoon. People in Idaho are going about the State wondering what is taking place in the halls of Congress. My State suffered along with the other seven States because of the very unsatisfactory vote which was taken in the Senate this afternoon. I know the distinguished minority leader wishes to be fair. I notice that he mentioned the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], and directed most of his remarks to the majority side of the aisle. I wish to pay my respects, if the distinguished Senator from Nebraska will abide with me, to the Senators on our side of the aisle who turned their tails and ran. In other words, I refer to the Senators who are Monday-Wednesday-Friday liberals, and Tuesday-Thursday-Saturday conservatives. They are the ones who hurt me. I am led by my political philosophy to suspect that certain things might be done by Senators on the other side of the aisle, but I wish to pay my respects to Senators on this side of the aisle who voted for aid to Italy and yet voted to cut the throat of the very deserving projects which went down in defeat this afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I appreciate very much the time which has been allotted to me by the majority leader.

I should like to conclude by making a brief summary. I am not arguing the merits of ECA aid. I simply state that if we are to cut the appropriations for domestic projects, as those appropriations are being cut here in the Senate, Senators who vote in favor of making those cuts in the appropriations should also be willing to vote for making of the same kind of cuts in the appropriations for the ECA and other foreign rehabilitation programs when they are considered by the Senate. Those Senators should certainly be consistent in their viewpoint, their purpose, and their performance.

If we are to continue to build towns, irrigation projects, and power-development projects in Italy, we certainly have a responsibility to keep the home fires burning, so to speak.

I feel that my vote in favor of the eight projects was justified not only because I had made a commitment in that respect, but also because of what we are giving away abroad. I believe that our first consideration should be for reclamation, irrigation, and development programs for the people of the United States. We are very generous with our aid to those in foreign countries who are the recipients of our material and our money, of which there will never be any repayment to the American taxpayer.

Mr. President, I thank the majority leader very much for yielding this much time to me.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I thought my good friend, the Senator from Nebraska, was going to thank me for my vote.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall do that, too.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RECLAMATION UNDER THE MARSHALL PLAN IN ITALY

(By W. E. Corfitzen, reclamation specialist, Economic Cooperation Administration, Rome, Italy)

PART I. HOW THE PROGRAM BEGAN

On April 3, 1948, Congress enacted the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (Public Law 472), carrying into law the principles of European economic recovery enunciated by Gen. George Marshall in his famous address at Harvard University on July 5, 1947. Thus was created the Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA) which has been popularly known as the Marshall plan. It is also often referred to as the European recovery program (ERP).

As a result of this legislation the United States made available to Italy about \$600,000,000 for the first year of operation (1948-49). A novel plan was devised for rapidly improving the Italian national economy. It will be recalled that following the war all European countries found themselves with a scarcity of almost every conceivable article. Black markets flourished. Luxury items commanded the highest prices, and merchants naturally endeavored to import those items on which they could make the greatest profits. In view of the extreme shortage of foreign exchange and the urgent need to improve the basic economy, the Marshall plan operated as follows:

Merchants who wanted to import commodities made application to the Italian Government for an import license and if, after examination, the Government was satisfied that the commodity was needed to improve the national economy, a license was granted. The merchant paid the price of the commodity in lire to the Italian Government which deposited the money in the National Treasury to what was known as the Counterpart Lira Fund. With merchants importing food, steel, machinery, spare parts, and all the other many items needed to restore basic economy, a large counterpart fund was built up. To spend this sum for the rapid improvement of the national economy, the Italian Government prepared a budget with the advice and assistance of the ECA Mission. Seventy billion lire was allocated to agriculture—about \$117,000,000. Of this amount, \$70,000,000 was allocated for reclamation projects. This program envisaged a total expenditure for reclamation projects of about \$300,000,000 during the period of ECA assistance—until July 1, 1952.

Italy is essentially a hilly and mountainous country, having a total area of 30,906,000 hectares (or 76,337,820 acres, 2.47 hectares equaling 1 acre) all but 2,367,000 of which are productive and of which 12,733,000 hectares (31,499,910 acres) are arable.

Water control and the construction of hydraulic works are old sciences in Italy, having started before the Roman era. In the province of Lombardy there are important irrigation projects which began about 1100. By the end of 1905, the total area irrigated was estimated at 1,500,000 hectares (3,750,000 acres). By 1939 many projects had been constructed, utilizing surface and underground water supplies, and the area was increased to 2,100,000 hectares (5,250,000 acres). During this same period many swamps, such as the Pontine Marshes, south of Rome, were reclaimed by the installation of large pumping plants, and plans were accordingly made for the extension of the reclamation program.

During the war many of these projects suffered damages, either actual war damage or deterioration caused by lack of maintenance. The end of the war found a number of projects with plans, which had been prepared prior to the war, and ready for expansion. But reorientation was required, especially in view of the lack of national funds, and social pressures and pressing requirements for additional food. Consequently, the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Public Works, and the National Land Reclamation and Irrigation Association undertook a study of the problems in the light of the then pressing and future requirements. It was decided that three principal problems existed:

1. Readjustment of water supplies and changes in obsolete irrigation systems.
2. Coordination of irrigation and power projects.

3. Coordination of planning activities and extension of irrigation systems.

This was the status of the program when the ECA mission began operations in Italy in the summer of 1948. Of the 18 countries participating in the Marshall plan, the Italian reclamation program was so far advanced that it was decided to send a reclamation specialist to Italy to concentrate on that program until programs for other countries could be presented and considered at a later date.

Preliminary examination revealed that the reclamation program in Italy involved considerably more than do reclamation programs in the United States. In the United States, generally, flood control, drainage, irrigation and incidental power developments are included, while the Italian program includes not only these aspects but also many others which would be required to develop land from a raw state to a fully going concern. Such features are highways, farm centers (including churches, schools, post and telegraph offices, police stations, and other civil services), farm buildings, transmission lines, etc. Another essential difference in the two programs is that in the United States, water user's organizations, in general, must repay to the Federal Government the cost of reclamation works over a 40-year period without interest. The Italian program is based upon the premise that reclamation works are a national benefit and that the costs will be repaid the Government through taxes on the lands developed. Under the Italian law the government contributes 87.5 percent of the cost of reclamation features to southern projects and 75 percent to northern projects, with local interests contributing 12.5 and 25 percent respectively. In the case of major features, such as construction of dams or river regulation, the government pays the entire cost.

In view of these essential differences it was decided that every project would be carefully screened in order that the mission

82^D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3790

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 13, 1951

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

4 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
5 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-
6 ment of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30,
7 1952, namely:

8 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

9 ENFORCEMENT OF CONNALLY HOT OIL ACT

10 For expenses necessary for controlling the interstate
11 shipment of contraband oil as required by law (15 U. S. C.



1 715), including purchase of not to exceed three passenger
 2 motor vehicles for replacement only ~~(1)~~\$174,000 \$158,-
 3 670 ~~(2)~~, of which not to exceed \$137,970 shall be available
 4 for personal services.

5 ~~(3)~~CONSTRUCTION, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRA-
 6 TION

7 ~~(4)~~For construction and acquisition of transmission lines,
 8 substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administra-
 9 tive expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the pro-
 10 visions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16
 11 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area,
 12 to remain available until expended, \$342,020.

13 ~~(5)~~The sum of \$1,758,400, the unobligated portion of, the
 14 \$1,850,000 appropriation contained in Chapter V of the
 15 Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law
 16 911, 81st Congress), under the heading "Department of the
 17 Interior, Southeastern Power Administration, Construction",
 18 is hereby rescinded and shall be carried to the surplus fund
 19 and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval
 20 of this Act.

21 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER
 22 ADMINISTRATION

23 For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance
 24 of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric
 25 power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5

1 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as
 2 applied to the southeastern power area, ~~(6)\$275,000~~
 3 *\$125,000.*

4 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

5 Appropriations of the Southeastern Power Administra-
 6 tion shall be available for purchase of not to exceed ~~(7)five~~
 7 *three* passenger motor vehicles. Appropriations made herein
 8 to the Southeastern Power Administration shall be available
 9 in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for
 10 operation and maintenance shall be available only for the
 11 service of the current fiscal year.

12 CONTINUING FUND, SOUTHEASTERN POWER

13 ADMINISTRATION

14 All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric
 15 power and energy under the provisions of section 5 of the
 16 Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (16 U. S. C.
 17 825s), generated or purchased in the southeastern power
 18 area, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States
 19 as miscellaneous receipts, except that the Treasury shall
 20 set up and maintain from such receipts a continuing fund of
 21 \$50,000, and said fund shall be placed to the credit of the
 22 Secretary, and shall be subject to check by him to defray
 23 emergency expenses necessary to insure continuity of electric
 24 service and continuous operation of Government facilities in
 25 said area ~~(8)~~: *Provided, That the following paragraph under*

1 the heading "Office of the Secretary, Continuing Fund,
2 Power Transmission Facilities", in the Interior Department
3 Appropriation Act, 1950 (Public Law 350, 81st Congress),
4 is hereby amended to read as follows:

5 CONTINUING FUND

6 Continuing Fund, Power Transmission Facilities: All
7 receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and
8 energy under the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control
9 Act of December 22, 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), generated
10 or purchased in the southwestern power area, shall be covered
11 into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous
12 receipts, except that the Treasury shall set up and maintain
13 from such receipts a continuing fund of \$300,000, includ-
14 ing the sum of \$100,000 in the continuing fund estab-
15 lished under the Administrator of the Southwestern Power
16 Administration in the First Supplemental National De-
17 fense Appropriation Act, 1944 (57 Stat. 621), which
18 shall be transferred to the fund hereby established: and
19 said fund of \$300,000 shall be placed to the credit
20 of the Secretary and shall be subject to check by him
21 to defray emergency expenses necessary to insure continuity
22 of electric service and continuous operation of the facilities.

23 CONSTRUCTION, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

24 For construction and acquisition of transmission lines,

1 substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administra-
 2 tive expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the pro-
 3 visions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16
 4 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area,
 5 to remain available until expended, ~~(9)~~\$3,375,000
 6 \$2,564,400, ~~(10)~~*of which not to exceed \$586,800 shall be*
 7 *available for personal services, and of which not to exceed*
 8 \$600,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant
 9 to authority previously granted ~~(10½)~~: *Provided, That*
 10 *\$250,000 of the amount appropriated herein shall be avail-*
 11 *able for purchase of electric power and energy and for leas-*
 12 *ing of transmission lines and related facilities of others*
 13 ~~(11):~~*Provided, That this appropriation shall not be ex-*
 14 *pended for the construction of facilities designated as com-*
 15 *prising the western Missouri project.*

16 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER
 17 ADMINISTRATION

18 For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance
 19 of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric
 20 power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5
 21 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as
 22 applied to the southwestern power area, ~~(12)~~\$1,275,000
 23 \$1,255,712 ~~(13)~~, *of which not to exceed \$900,712 shall be*
 24 *available for personal services.*

1 (14) *TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FACILITIES, DENISON DAM*
2 *PROJECT*

3 *The jurisdiction and control of the Denison-Payne 132-*
4 *kilovolt transmission line is hereby vested in the Secretary*
5 *of the Interior, and the interdepartmental accounts shall be*
6 *adjusted accordingly.*

7 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

8 Appropriations of the Southwestern Power Administra-
9 tion shall be available for purchase of not to exceed (15) fif-
10 teen *eight* passenger motor vehicles (16), ~~of which eight~~
11 ~~shall be~~ for replacement only. Appropriations made herein
12 to the Southwestern Power Administration shall be avail-
13 able in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made
14 for operation and maintenance shall be available only for the
15 service of the current fiscal year.

16 COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

17 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

18 For expenses made necessary by the Act establishing
19 a Commission of Fine Arts (40 U. S. C. 104), including
20 payment of actual traveling expenses of the members and
21 secretary of the Commission in attending meetings and
22 committee meetings of the Commission either within or out-
23 side the District of Columbia, to be disbursed on vouchers
24 approved by the Commission, (17)~~\$20,000~~ \$14,530.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, ~~(18)\$62,000,000~~ \$67,500,000, ~~(19)~~ of which not to exceed \$8,387,470 shall be available for personal services, and of which not to exceed \$21,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system and of marketing electric power and energy, ~~(20)\$5,250,000~~ \$5,368,439 ~~(21)~~, of which not to exceed \$3,983,862 shall be available for personal services.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed upon the Administrator pursuant to law, including not to exceed \$40,000 for services as authorized by Section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including such services at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem for individuals; purchase of not to exceed twelve passenger motor vehicles ~~(22)of which twelve shall be for replacement only; and pur-~~

chase (not to exceed two) of aircraft. Appropriations made herein to the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for operation and maintenance shall be available only for the service of the current fiscal year.

Not to exceed 12 per centum of the appropriation for construction herein made for the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available for construction work by force account or on a hired-labor basis, except in case of emergencies, local in character, so declared by the Bonneville Power Administrator.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and performance of other functions, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management (23) \$6,900,000, of which \$1,200,000 shall be used for soil and moisture conservation \$7,722,605, of which not to exceed \$4,864,096 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That this appropriation may be expended on a reimbursable basis for surveys of lands other than those under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

(24) CONSTRUCTION

For construction of access roads on the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands; acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads adjacent to such lands; to remain available until expended, \$995,000, of which not to exceed \$45,000 shall be available for personal services: Provided, That the amount appropriated herein for road construction shall be transferred to the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce.

(25) *The last sentence of subsection (b) of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 874), is amended to read as follows: "When the general fund in the Treasury has been fully reimbursed for the expenditures which were made charges against the Oregon and California land-grant fund, said 25 per centum shall be covered annually, on or after June 30, into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."*

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

*Appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management shall be available for purchase of not to exceed **(26)**~~thirty-two~~ *twenty-five* passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and alteration and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities to which the United States has title:*

1 *Provided*, That of appropriations herein made for the Bureau
2 of Land Management expenditures in connection with the re-
3 vested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos
4 Bay Wagon Road grant lands shall be reimbursed from the
5 25 per centum referred to in section C, title II, of the Act
6 approved August 28, 1937, of the special fund designated the
7 "Oregon and California Land Grant Fund" and section 4
8 of the Act approved May 24, 1939, of the special fund des-
9 ignated the "Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant Fund".

10

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

11 For construction, purchase, and maintenance of range
12 improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and
13 10 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C.
14 315), sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received,
15 during the current fiscal year, as range improvement fees
16 under section 3 of said Act and of 25 per centum of all
17 moneys received, during the current fiscal year, under sec-
18 tion 15 of said Act, to remain available until expended.

19

PAYMENTS TO STATES (PROCEEDS OF SALES)

20 For payment to the several States of 5 per centum of
21 the net proceeds of sales of public lands and materials lying
22 within their limits, for the purpose of education or of
23 making public roads and improvements, sums equal to the
24 aggregate of all moneys received in accordance with sec-
25 tion 4 of the Act of June 26, 1934 (31 U. S. C. 725c),

1 during the current and succeeding fiscal years, and includ-
2 ing in the fiscal year 1952 the unappropriated balance of
3 receipts of prior fiscal years, to remain available until
4 expended.

5 PAYMENT TO OKLAHOMA (ROYALTIES)

6 For payment to the State of Oklahoma in lieu of all
7 State and local taxes upon tribal funds accruing under the
8 provisions of the joint resolution of June 12, 1926 (44
9 Stat. 740), to be expended by the State in the same manner
10 as if received under section 35 of the Act approved February
11 25, 1920 (30 U. S. C. 191), sums equal to $37\frac{1}{2}$ per centum
12 of the royalties received during the current and each suc-
13 ceeding fiscal year, from the south half of Red River in
14 Oklahoma under the provisions of said joint resolution of
15 June 12, 1926, to remain available until expended.

16 LEASING OF GRAZING LANDS

17 For leasing State, county, or privately owned lands in
18 accordance with the provisions of the Act of June 23, 1938
19 (43 U. S. C. 315m-1), sums equal to the aggregate of
20 all moneys received during the current and each succeeding
21 fiscal year, in accordance with the Act of June 23, 1938
22 (43 U. S. C. 315m-4), to remain available until expended.

23 PAYMENTS TO STATES (GRAZING FEES)

24 Sums not in excess of $33\frac{1}{3}$ per centum of all grazing fees
25 received during the current and each succeeding fiscal year

1 from each grazing district on Indian lands ceded to the
 2 United States for disposition under the public-land laws, to
 3 remain available until expended for payment to the State in
 4 which said lands are situated, in accordance with the pro-
 5 visions of section 11 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended
 6 (43 U. S. C. 315j).

7 BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

8 (27) SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, \$65,-
 10 000,000, to be available in not to exceed the amounts
 11 indicated respectively for the following purposes:

12 (28) HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE SERVICES

13 (29) Health, education, and welfare services: For expenses
 14 necessary to provide health, education, and welfare services
 15 for Indians, either directly or in cooperation with States and
 16 other organizations, including payment (in advance or from
 17 date of admission) of care, tuition, assistance, and other
 18 expenses of Indians in boarding homes, institutions, or
 19 schools; grants and other assistance to needy Indians; main-
 20 tenance of law and order, and payment of rewards for
 21 information or evidence concerning violations of law on
 22 Indian reservations or lands; and operation of Indian arts
 23 and craft shops and museum; (30) \$43,600,000 \$41,324,750
 24 (31), of which not to exceed \$23,699,661 shall be available
 25 for personal services.

(32) *RESOURCES MANAGEMENT*

(33) ~~Resources management~~: For expenses necessary for management, development, improvement, and protection of resources and appurtenant facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including payment of irrigation assessments and charges; acquisition of water rights; conducting agricultural experiments and demonstrations; furnishing plants or seed to Indians; advances for Indian industrial and business enterprises; payment of expenses of Indian fairs, including premiums for exhibits; and development of Indian arts and crafts as authorized by law (25 U. S. C. 305), including expenses of exhibits; (34) ~~\$11,400,000~~ \$10,921,360 (35), of which not to exceed \$6,843,485 shall be available for personal services.

(36) *CONSTRUCTION*

(37) ~~Construction~~: For construction, major repair, and improvement of irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, roads and trails, and other facilities; acquisition of lands and interests in lands; preparation of lands for farming; and architectural and engineering services by contract; to remain available until expended, (38) ~~\$12,000,000~~, \$10,000,000, (39) of which not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be available for personal services, and of which not to exceed \$3,125,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted: *Provided*, That no

1 part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for the
 2 acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, California,
 3 Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming
 4 outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations:
 5 *Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be*
 6 *used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the*
 7 *States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside or*
 8 *outside the boundaries of existing reservations (40): Pro-*
 9 *vided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be*
 10 *used for construction or repair of the Tongue River Indian*
 11 *Reservation electric line, Montana, but the Secretary is hereby*
 12 *authorized to enter into a reimbursable contract with the*
 13 *Tongue River Electric Cooperative, Incorporated, Montana,*
 14 *with respect to maintenance, operation, and subsequent*
 15 *transfer of ownership of said line.*

16 (41) GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

17 (42) General administrative expenses: For expenses neces-
 18 sary for the general administration of the Bureau of In-
 19 dian Affairs, including such expenses in field offices,
 20 (43) ~~\$3,600,000~~ \$3,300,747 (44), of which not to exceed
 21 \$2,693,281 shall be available for personal services.

22 (45) REVOLVING FUND FOR LOANS

23 (46) Revolving fund for loans: For an additional amount
 24 for loans as authorized by sections 10 and 11 of the Act

1 of June 18, 1934 (25 U. S. C. 470, 471), as amended
 2 and supplemented, and section 1 of the Act of April 19,
 3 1950 (Public Law 474), \$800,000.

4 **(47)** *PAYMENT TO CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW NATIONS OF*
 5 *INDIANS, OKLAHOMA*

6 **(48)** *Payment to Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of*
 7 *Indians, Oklahoma:* For an additional amount for "Payment
 8 to Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians, Oklahoma",
 9 for defraying the expenses of making per capita payments
 10 authorized by the Acts of June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 483),
 11 and June 24, 1948 (Public Law 754, Eightieth Congress),
 12 **(49)** *\$25,000 \$22,655 (50), of which not to exceed \$21,105*
 13 *shall be available for personal services.*

14 *ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS*

15 Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except
 16 the revolving fund for loans) shall be available for purchase
 17 of not to exceed **(51)** *one hundred and ninety-one passenger*
 18 *motor vehicles, of which one hundred and ninety-one shall*
 19 *be for replacement only one hundred and twenty-five passen-*
 20 *ger motor vehicles for replacement only, which may be used*
 21 *for the transportation of Indians; purchase of ice for official*
 22 *use of employees; services as authorized by section 15 of the*
 23 *Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including not to ex-*
 24 *ceed \$5,000 for expenditure at rates for individuals not in-*

1 excess of \$50 per diem on irrigation and power matters,
2 when authorized by the Secretary; and expenses required
3 by continuing or permanent treaty provisions.

4 CLAIMS AND TREATY OBLIGATIONS

5 For fulfilling treaties with Senecas and Six Nations of
6 New York, Choctaws and Pawnees of Oklahoma, and pay-
7 ment to Indians of Sioux reservations, to be expended as
8 provided by law, such amounts as may be necessary after
9 June 30, 1951.

10 PROCEEDS FROM POWER

11 Sums not in excess of the amount of power revenues
12 covered into the Treasury during the current and each suc-
13 ceeding fiscal year to the credit of each of the power projects,
14 including revenues credited prior to August 7, 1946, to
15 remain available until expended for the purposes authorized
16 by section 3 of the Act of August 7, 1946, as amended
17 (31 U. S. C. 725s-3), in connection with the respective
18 projects from which such revenues are derived.

19 TRIBAL FUNDS

20 In addition to the tribal funds authorized to be expended
21 by existing law, there is hereby appropriated \$2,109,000
22 from tribal funds not otherwise available for expenditure for
23 the benefit of Indians and Indian tribes, including pay and
24 travel expenses of employees; care, tuition and other assist-
25 ance to Indian children attending public and private schools

1 (which may be paid in advance or from date of admission) ;
 2 purchase of land and improvements on land, title to which
 3 shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for
 4 the tribe for which purchased ; lease of lands and water rights ;
 5 compensation and expenses of attorneys and other per-
 6 sons employed by Indian tribes under approved contracts ;
 7 pay, travel and other expenses of tribal officers, councils,
 8 and committees thereof, or other tribal organizations, in-
 9 cluding mileage for use of privately owned automobiles
 10 and per diem in lieu of subsistence at rates established
 11 administratively but not to exceed those applicable to
 12 civilian employees of the Government ; relief of Indians,
 13 without regard to section 7 of the Act of May 27, 1930
 14 (46 Stat. 391), including cash grants ; and employment of a
 15 recreational director for the Menominee Reservation and a
 16 curator for the Osage Museum, each of whom shall be
 17 appointed with the approval of the respective tribal councils
 18 and without regard to the classification laws: *Provided*, That
 19 in addition to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds
 20 may be advanced to Indian tribes during the current fiscal
 21 year for such purposes as may be designated by the gov-
 22 erning body of the particular tribe involved and approved by
 23 the Secretary: *Provided* (52)~~further~~, however, That no part
 24 of this appropriation (53)~~or other tribal funds~~ shall be used

1 for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of
 2 Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming, either inside
 3 or outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations.

4 BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

5 For carrying out the functions of the Bureau of Recla-
 6 mation as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (Act of
 7 June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof
 8 or supplementary thereto) and other Acts applicable to
 9 that Bureau, as follows:

10 GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

11 For engineering and economic investigations of pro-
 12 posed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water
 13 conservation and development plans; engineering and eco-
 14 nomic investigations, as a basis for legislation, and for
 15 reports thereon to Congress, relating to projects for the
 16 development and utilization of the water resources of
 17 Alaska; formulating plans and preparing designs and speci-
 18 fications for authorized Federal reclamation projects or
 19 parts thereof prior to appropriations for construction of
 20 such projects or parts; and activities preliminary to the
 21 reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial ad-
 22 justment, or extension of existing projects; to remain
 23 available until expended, ~~(54)~~\$4,000,000, \$4,600,000,
 24 ~~(55)~~ of which not to exceed \$3,163,396 shall be avail-
 25 able for personal services, and of which ~~(56)~~\$3,500,000

1 \$3,903,500 shall be derived from the reclamation fund
 2 and \$500,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River
 3 development fund: *Provided*, That the expenditure of
 4 any sums from this appropriation for investigations of
 5 any nature requested by States, municipalities, or other
 6 interests shall be upon the basis of the State, munici-
 7 pality, or other interest advancing at least 50 per centum of
 8 the estimated cost of such investigations: *Provided further*,
 9 That, except as herein expressly provided with respect to
 10 investigations in Alaska, no part of this appropriation shall be
 11 expended in the conduct of activities which are not author-
 12 ized by law.

13 CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

14 For construction and rehabilitation of authorized rec-
 15 lamation projects or parts thereof (including power trans-
 16 mission facilities (57) *and including a payment to the Grand*
 17 *Coulee School District, Washington, for school facilities,*
 18 *proportionate to the payment made to the Coulee Dam Dis-*
 19 *trict, Washington, in fiscal 1951, based on relative enroll-*
 20 *ment of dependents of Bureau of Reclamation and contractor*
 21 *employees) and for other related activities, as authorized by*
 22 *law, to remain available until expended, (58)\$197,000,000,*
 23 *\$208,535,450, (59)of which not to exceed \$29,160,408*
 24 *shall be available for personal services, and of which*
 25 *(60)\$29,202,200 \$28,972,650 shall be derived from the rec-*

1 lamation fund (61): ~~Provided, That no part of this appropri-~~
2 ~~ation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission~~
3 ~~facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service~~
4 ~~contracts which include provision for service to Federal estab-~~
5 ~~lishments and preferred customers: Provided, That no part~~
6 ~~of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction~~
7 ~~of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power~~
8 ~~wheeling service contracts which include provision for service~~
9 ~~to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except~~
10 ~~those transmission facilities for which construction funds have~~
11 ~~been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are neces-~~
12 ~~sary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities~~
13 ~~for which the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling~~
14 ~~agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration~~
15 ~~of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment~~
16 ~~or preferred customer (62): Provided further, That in~~
17 ~~order to promote agreement among the States of Nebraska,~~
18 ~~Wyoming, and Colorado, and to avoid any possible altera-~~
19 ~~tion of existing vested water rights, no part of this or of any~~
20 ~~prior appropriation shall be used for construction or for~~
21 ~~further commitment for construction of the Glendo unit or~~
22 ~~any feature thereof, until a definite plan report thereon has~~
23 ~~been completed, reviewed by the States of Nebraska, Wyom-~~
24 ~~ing, and Colorado, and approved by Congress (63): Pro-~~
25 ~~vided further, That no part of this or prior appropriations~~

1 *shall be used for construction, nor for further commitments to*
 2 *construction of Moorhead Dam and Reservoir, Montana, or*
 3 *any feature thereof until a definite plan report thereon has*
 4 *been completed, reviewed by the States of Wyoming and*
 5 *Montana, and approved by the Congress.*

6 Of the amount appropriated under the preceding para-
 7 graph, \$1,000,000 is for partial liquidation of the contract
 8 authority granted under the appropriation "General fund,
 9 construction, Missouri River Basin", in the Interior Depart-
 10 ment Appropriation Act, 1950.

11 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

12 For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects
 13 or parts thereof and of other facilities, as authorized by law;
 14 and for a soil and moisture conservation program on lands
 15 under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant
 16 to law, ~~(64)\$15,094,000~~ \$15,977,594, of which ~~(65)not~~
 17 ~~to exceed (66)\$12,592,000~~ \$12,476,494 shall be derived
 18 from the reclamation fund and ~~(67)not to exceed~~
 19 \$1,671,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River
 20 dam fund ~~(68)~~, and of which not to exceed \$10,331,434
 21 shall be available for personal services: *Provided,*
 22 That funds advanced for operation and maintenance
 23 of reclamation projects or parts thereof shall be de-
 24 posited to the credit of this appropriation and may be
 25 expended for the same objects and in the same man-

ner as sums appropriated herein may be expended,
and the unexpended balances of such advances shall be
credited to the appropriation for the next succeeding fiscal
year.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of general administration and
related functions in the offices of the Commissioner of Rec-
lamation and in the regional offices of the Bureau of Recla-
mation, ~~(69)\$5,500,000~~ \$5,478,203 ~~(70)~~, of which not to
exceed \$4,696,178 shall be available for personal services, to
be derived from the reclamation fund and to be non-
reimbursable pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945
(43 U. S. C. 377): *Provided*, That no part of any
other appropriation in this Act shall be available for
activities or functions budgeted for the current fiscal year
as general administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That
not exceeding \$150,000 of funds available for expenditure
under this appropriation shall be used for salaries and ex-
penses in connection with information work.

EMERGENCY FUND

For an additional amount for the emergency fund as
authorized by the Act of June 26, 1948 (43 U. S. C. 502),
~~(71)\$500,000~~ \$400,000, to be derived from the Reclamation
fund, special fund, and to remain available until expended
for the purposes specified in said Act.

1 **(72)TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FACILITIES, FORT PECK**
 2 **PROJECT, MONTANA**

3 *The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to trans-*
 4 *fer to the Department of the Interior without exchange of*
 5 *funds, all of the right, title, and interest of the Department*
 6 *of the Army in and to the following facilities, including*
 7 *rights-of-way (except that portion of the rights-of-way within*
 8 *the Fort Peck Reservoir area), but there shall be reserved*
 9 *the right to use the power facilities for the purpose of trans-*
 10 *mitting power to the Fort Peck project during emergency*
 11 *periods when the Fort Peck power plant is not functioning:*
 12 *(a) the Fort Peck-Rainbow (Great Falls) 161 kilovolt*
 13 *transmission line; (b) the Rainbow (Great Falls) terminal*
 14 *facilities; and (c) the Fort Peck-Whatley 50 kilovolt trans-*
 15 *mission line and substation.*

16 **SPECIAL FUNDS**

17 Sums herein referred to as being derived from the recla-
 18 mation fund, the Colorado River dam fund, or the Colorado
 19 River development fund, are appropriated from the special
 20 funds in the Treasury created by the Act of June 17, 1902
 21 (43 U. S. C. 391), the Act of December 21, 1928 (43
 22 U. S. C. 617a), and the Act of July 19, 1940 (43 U. S. C.
 23 618a), respectively. Such sums shall be transferred, upon
 24 request of the Secretary, to be merged with and expended
 25 under the heads herein specified; and the unexpended bal-

ances of sums transferred for expenditure under the heads
 “Operation and maintenance” and “General administrative
 expenses” shall revert and be credited to the special fund
 from which derived.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation shall be
 available for purchase of not to exceed one hundred
 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed
 (73)\$30,000 \$50,000 for services as authorized by section
 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including
 such services at rates for individuals not to exceed (74)\$50
 \$100 per day, when authorized by the Secretary; payment of
 claims for damage to or loss of property, personal injury, or
 death arising out of activities of the Bureau of Reclamation;
 payment, except as otherwise provided for, of compensation
 and expense of persons on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclama-
 tion appointed as authorized by law to represent the United
 States in the negotiation and administration of interstate com-
 pacts without reimbursement or return under the reclamation
 laws; rewards for information or evidence concerning viola-
 tions of law involving property under the jurisdiction of the
 Bureau of Reclamation; performance of the functions specified
 under the head “Operation and Maintenance Administration”,
 Bureau of Reclamation, in the Interior Department Appro-
 priation Act, 1945; preparation and dissemination of useful

1 information including recordings, photographs, and photo-
 2 graphic prints; and studies of recreational uses of reservoir
 3 areas, ~~(75)as authorized by law and investigation and re-~~
 4 *covery of archeological and paleontological remains in such*
 5 *areas in the same manner as provided for in the Act of*
 6 *August 21, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 461-467): Provided, That no*
 7 part of any appropriation made herein shall be available
 8 pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377),
 9 for expenses other than those incurred on behalf of specific
 10 reclamation projects except ~~(76)\$5,500,000 under the head~~
 11 “General Administrative Expenses” and ~~(77)\$1,000,000~~
 12 *amounts provided for reconnaissance, basin surveys, and gen-*
 13 *eral engineering and research under the head “General*
 14 *Investigations.”*

15 Allotments to the Missouri River Basin project from the
 16 appropriation under the head “Construction and rehabilita-
 17 tion” shall be available additionally for said project for those
 18 functions of the Bureau of Reclamation provided for under
 19 the head “General investigations” (but this authorization
 20 shall not preclude use of the appropriation under said head
 21 within that area), and for the continuation of investigations
 22 by agencies of the Department on a general plan for the
 23 development of the Missouri River Basin. Such allotments
 24 may be expended through or in cooperation with State and

1 other Federal agencies, and advances to such agencies are
2 hereby authorized.

3 Sums appropriated herein which are expended in the
4 performance of functions of the Bureau of Reclamation shall
5 be reimbursable or returnable to the extent and in the manner
6 provided by law.

7 Any agency of the United States Government having
8 title thereto is authorized to transfer to the Bureau of
9 Reclamation, without reimbursement, parts, equipment and
10 supplies for aircraft excess to its needs.

11 No part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Rec-
12 lamation, contained in this Act or in any prior Act,
13 which represents amounts earned under the terms of a con-
14 tract but remaining unpaid, shall be obligated for any other
15 purpose, regardless of when such amounts are to be paid:
16 *Provided*, That the incurring of any obligation prohibited
17 by this paragraph shall be deemed a violation of section
18 665 of title 31 of the United States Code.

19 No funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation
20 for operation and maintenance, except those derived from
21 advances by water users, shall be used for the particular
22 benefit of lands (a) within the boundaries of an irrigation
23 district, (b) of any member of a water users' organization,
24 or (c) of any individual, when such district, organization,
25 or individual is in arrears for more than twelve months

1 in the payment of charges due under a contract entered
 2 into with the United States pursuant to laws administered
 3 by the Bureau of Reclamation.

4 Not to exceed ~~(78)\$1,684,000~~ \$2,783,000 of the ap-
 5 propriation herein made for "Construction and rehabilitation,
 6 Bureau of Reclamation" shall be ~~(79)available for expendi-~~
 7 ~~ture toward~~ expended for completion of construction of the
 8 Coachella division of the All-American Canal system, Boulder
 9 Canyon project: *Provided, That* ~~(80)prior thereto con-~~
 10 ~~tractual arrangements satisfactory to the Secretary shall be~~
 11 ~~made for repayment of any sums~~ ~~(81)thereof~~ so expended in
 12 excess of the amount required to be repaid under the existing
 13 contract between the Coachella ~~(82)Valley~~ County Water
 14 District and the United States ~~(83)shall be repayable by said~~
 15 *district to the United States unless said district shall be judi-*
 16 *cially determined to be not liable therefor.*

17 Not to exceed 12 per centum of the construction allot-
 18 ment made by the Bureau of Reclamation for any project
 19 from the appropriation "Construction and Rehabilitation"
 20 contained in this Act shall be available for construction
 21 work by force account or on a hired-labor basis; except
 22 that not to exceed \$225,000 may on approval of the Com-
 23 missioner be expended for construction work by force
 24 account on any one project or Missouri Basin unit when the
 25 work is unsuitable for contract or when excessive bids are

received; and except in cases of emergencies local in character, so declared by the Commissioner.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for the Geological Survey to perform surveys, investigations, and research covering topography, geology, and the mineral and water resources of the United States, its Territories and possessions; classify lands as to mineral character and water and power resources; give engineering supervision to power permits and Federal Power Commission licenses; enforce departmental regulations applicable to oil, gas, and other mining leases, permits, licenses, and operating contracts; and publish and disseminate data relative to the foregoing activities; ~~(84)\$21,900,000,~~ \$21,300,000, ~~(85)~~of which not to exceed \$13,455,000 shall be available for personal services, and of which \$3,300,000 shall be available only for cooperation with States or municipalities for water resources investigations: *Provided*, That the share of the Geological Survey in any topographic mapping or water resources investigations carried on in cooperation with any State or municipality shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost thereof.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The amount appropriated for the Geological Survey shall be available for purchase of not to exceed eighty passen-

ger motor vehicles for replacement only; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service for protection of confidential files; contracting for the furnishing of topographic maps and for the making of geophysical or other specialized surveys when it is administratively determined that such procedures are in the public interest; construction and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands for gaging stations; and payment of compensation and expenses (not to exceed \$10,000) of the person appointed by the President to participate as the representative of the United States in the administration of the compact consented to by the Act of May 31, 1949 (Public Law 82): *Provided, That* notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President is authorized to appoint a retired officer as such representative, without prejudice to his status as a retired Army officer, and he shall receive such compensation and expenses in addition to his retired pay.

BUREAU OF MINES

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL

RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for promoting the conservation, exploration, development, production, and utilization of mineral resources, including fuels, in the United States, its Ter-

1 ritories, and possessions; developing synthetics and substi-
 2 tutes; producing and distributing helium; and controlling
 3 fires in inactive coal deposits on public lands, and on private
 4 lands, with the consent of the owners; ~~(86)\$17,950,000~~
 5 ~~\$16,858,603~~ (87), of which not to exceed \$10,446,575 shall
 6 be available for personal services: *Provided*, That the Secre-
 7 tary is hereby authorized and directed to make suitable
 8 arrangements with owners of private property or with a
 9 State or its subdivisions for payment of a sum equal to not
 10 less than one-half the amount of expenditure to be made
 11 for control or extinguishment of fires in inactive coal deposits
 12 from funds provided under the authorization of this Act
 13 except that expenditure of Federal funds for this purpose
 14 in any privately owned operating coal mine shall be limited
 15 to investigation and supervision.

16 HEALTH AND SAFETY

17 For expenses necessary for promotion of health and
 18 safety in mines and in the minerals industries, as authorized
 19 by law, \$3,790,000.

20 CONSTRUCTION

21 For construction and improvement of facilities under
 22 the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Mines, to remain available
 23 until expended, ~~(88)\$1,250,000~~ \$1,587,412 (89), of which
 24 not to exceed \$113,287 shall be available for personal services.

1 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

2 For expenses necessary for general administration of the
3 Bureau of Mines, including such expenses in the regional
4 offices, ~~(90)\$1,290,000~~ \$1,176,841 ~~(91)~~, of which not to
5 exceed \$1,018,434 shall be available for personal services.

6 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

7 Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of
8 Mines may be expended for purchase of not to exceed one
9 hundred and thirty passenger motor vehicles for replacement
10 only; providing transportation services in isolated areas for
11 employees, student dependents of employees, and other pupils,
12 and such activities may be financed under cooperative arrange-
13 ments; temporary and emergency contracts for personal serv-
14 ices and employment of persons without regard to civil-service
15 regulations as required in the conduct of programs for the
16 control of fires in inactive coal deposits and flood prevention
17 in anthracite mines; purchase and bestowal of certificates
18 and trophies in connection with mine rescue and first-aid
19 work: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to accept
20 lands, buildings, equipment and other contributions from
21 public and private sources and to prosecute projects in coop-
22 eration with other agencies, Federal, State, or private: *Pro-*
23 *vided further*, That power produced in the operation of the
24 power plant of the Bureau of Mines at Louisiana, Missouri,

1 in excess of the Bureau's needs may be sold to non-Federal
2 purchasers, but the expenses of the Bureau in the production
3 and sale of such excess power shall not exceed the total
4 amount of such sales, and expenditures for the production
5 of excess power shall not be deemed a charge against the
6 total appropriations authorized by the Synthetic Liquid Fuels
7 Act, as amended: *Provided further*, That the sums made
8 available for the current fiscal year to the Departments of the
9 Army, Navy, and Air Force for the acquisition of helium
10 from the Bureau of Mines shall be transferred to the Bureau
11 of Mines on July 1 of said fiscal year: *Provided further*,
12 That the Bureau of Mines is authorized, during the current
13 fiscal year, to sell directly or through any Government
14 agency, including corporations, any metal or mineral product
15 that may be manufactured in pilot plants operated by the
16 Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such sales shall be
17 covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

18 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

19 MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

20 For expenses necessary for the management and pro-
21 tection of the areas and facilities administered by the
22 National Park Service, including protection of lands in
23 process of condemnation; and for plans, investigations, and
24 studies of the recreational resources (exclusive of prepara-
25 tion of detailed plans and working drawings) and archaeo-

1 logical values in river basins of the United States (except
 2 the Missouri River Basin) ; \$7,735,000(92), of which not to
 3 exceed \$6,584,342 shall be available for personal services:
 4 *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of the appropriation
 5 granted under this head for the fiscal year 1951 for the
 6 "Mississippi River Parkway" shall remain available during
 7 the current fiscal year.

8 MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL
 9 FACILITIES

10 For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance,
 11 and rehabilitation of roads, trails, buildings, utilities, and
 12 other physical facilities essential to the operation of areas
 13 administered pursuant to law by the National Park Service,
 14 (93)\$7,300,000 \$7,369,790(94), of which not to exceed
 15 \$4,193,747 shall be available for personal services.

16 CONSTRUCTION

17 For construction and improvement, without regard to
 18 the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended (16 U. S. C. 451),
 19 of roads, trails, parkways, buildings, utilities, and other
 20 physical facilities; and the acquisition of lands, interests
 21 therein, improvements, and water rights; to remain avail-
 22 able until expended, (95)\$11,975,000 \$11,370,000, (96) of
 23 which not to exceed \$945,000 shall be available for personal
 24 services, and of which \$1,150,000 is for liquidation of obliga-
 25 tions incurred pursuant to authority granted under the head

1 "Independence National Historical Park, Pennsylvania".
 2 in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950.
 3 and \$3,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred
 4 pursuant to authority contained in section 4 (b) of the
 5 Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

6 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

7 For expenses necessary for general administration of
 8 the National Park Service, including such expenses in the
 9 regional offices, ~~(97)\$1,284,500~~ \$1,171,774 (98), of which
 10 not to exceed \$1,014,538 shall be available for personal
 11 services.

12 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

13 Appropriations for the National Park Service shall be
 14 available for purchase of not to exceed nineteen passenger
 15 motor vehicles for replacement only; cleaning and repair
 16 of uniforms for National Capital Parks police and guards;
 17 and the objects and purposes specified in the Act of August
 18 7, 1946 (16 U. S. C. 17j-2).

19 FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

20 MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES

21 For expenses necessary for conservation, management,
 22 protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources, and
 23 for the performance of other authorized functions related to
 24 such resources; operation of the industrial properties within
 25 the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770);

1 maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita
 2 Mountains Wildlife Refuge; purchase or rent of land, and
 3 functions related to wildlife management in California (16
 4 U. S. C. 695-695c) ; and not to exceed \$30,000 for pay-
 5 ment, in the discretion of the Secretary, for information or
 6 evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the
 7 Fish and Wildlife Service; (99)~~\$6,870,000~~ \$6,606,558
 8 (100), of which not to exceed \$4,259,363 shall be available
 9 for personal services.

10 INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

11 For expenses necessary for scientific and economic
 12 studies*and investigations respecting conservation, manage-
 13 ment, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife re-
 14 sources, including related aquatic plants and products; col-
 15 lection, compilation, and publication of information concern-
 16 ing such studies and investigations; and the performance of
 17 other functions related thereto; as authorized by law;
 18 (101)~~\$3,875,000~~ \$3,858,986 (102), of which not to exceed
 19 \$2,487,629 shall be available for personal services:
 20 (103)Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall
 21 be used for investigations, surveys, studies, trapping or
 22 similar work in foreign countries.

23 CONSTRUCTION

24 For construction and acquisition of buildings and other
 25 facilities required in the conservation, management, pro-

1 tection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources and the
 2 acquisition of lands and interests therein, including con-
 3 tinuing the construction of fish cultural facilities on lands
 4 owned by the State of South Dakota; to remain available
 5 until expended, ~~(104)\$750,000~~ \$733,742 (105), of which
 6 not to exceed \$146,324 shall be available for personal
 7 services.

8 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

9 For expenses necessary for general administration of the
 10 Fish and Wildlife Service, including such expenses in the
 11 regional offices, ~~(106)\$882,000~~ \$806,631 (107), of which
 12 not to exceed \$678,319 shall be available for personal
 13 services.

14 FEDERAL AID IN FISH RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT

15 For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 9,
 16 1950 (Public Law 681), amounts equal to the revenues
 17 described in section 3 of said Act and credited during the next
 18 preceding fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, to remain
 19 available until expended.

20 ADMINISTRATION OF PRIBILOF ISLANDS

21 For carrying out the provisions of the Act of February
 22 26, 1944, as amended (16 U. S. C. 631a-631q), amounts
 23 equal to 60 per centum of the proceeds covered into the
 24 Treasury during the next preceding fiscal year from the

1 sale of sealskins and other products, to remain available for
2 expenditure during the current and next succeeding fiscal
3 years.

4 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

5 Appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service shall
6 be available for purchase of not to exceed seventy-four pas-
7 senger motor vehicles for replacement only; purchase
8 of not to exceed six aircraft for replacement only;
9 publication and distribution of bulletins as authorized
10 by law (7 U. S. C. 417); rations or commutation
11 of rations for officers and crews of vessels at rates
12 not to exceed \$2 per man per day; repair of
13 damage to public roads within and adjacent to reserva-
14 tion areas caused by operations of the Fish and Wildlife
15 Service; options for the purchase of land at not to ex-
16 ceed \$1 for each option; facilities incident to such public
17 recreational uses on conservation areas as are not inconsistent
18 with their primary purposes; and the maintenance and im-
19 provement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities under the
20 jurisdiction of the Fish and Wildlife Service and to which
21 the United States has title, and which are utilized pursuant
22 to law in connection with management and investigation
23 of fish and wildlife resources.

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

(108) For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, for expenditure as authorized by law, \$7,020,000.

For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including expenses of the offices of the Governors of Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, as authorized by law (48 U. S. C., secs. 61, 531, 1422, 1431a (c)), expenses of the Government of the Virgin Islands including the agricultural station, as authorized by law (48 U. S. C. 1405, 7 U. S. C. 386g), and expenses of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands appointed pursuant to the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress; compensation and mileage of members of the legislatures in Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and American Samoa as authorized by law (48 U. S. C., secs. 87, 599, 1421d (e), and 1431a (c)); compensation and expenses of the judiciary in American Samoa as authorized by law (48 U. S. C. 1431a (c)) and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress; care of insane as authorized by law for

1 *Alaska (48 U. S. C. 46-50); grants to the Virgin Islands,*
2 *Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the*
3 *Pacific Islands, in addition to current local revenues, for*
4 *support of governmental functions; and not to exceed \$50,000*
5 *for personal services, household equipment and furnishings,*
6 *and utilities necessary in the operation of the several Gov-*
7 *ernors' houses; \$7,020,000, of which not to exceed \$811,865*
8 *shall be available for personal services: Provided, That the*
9 *Territorial and local governments of the Virgin Islands,*
10 *Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the*
11 *Pacific Islands are authorized to make purchases through the*
12 *General Services Administration: Provided further, That*
13 *appropriations available for the Administration of Territories,*
14 *including the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, may be*
15 *expended for the purchase, maintenance, and operation of not*
16 *to exceed four aircraft, 1 AK and 6 AKL type surface*
17 *vessels, and such minor vessels as may be required, for official*
18 *purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found*
19 *by the Secretary to be necessary in carrying out the pro-*
20 *visions of Article 6 (2) of the trusteeship agreement approved*
21 *by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress.*

22 ALASKA PUBLIC WORKS

23 For an additional amount for expenses necessary for
24 carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 24, 1949
25 (Public Law 264), to remain available until June 30, 1955,

1 ~~(109)\$7,000,000~~ \$8,500,000, of which not to exceed
 2 ~~(110)\$500,000~~ \$463,000 shall be available for administra-
 3 tive expenses ~~(111)~~, and of which not to exceed \$333,000
 4 shall be available for personal services.

5 CONSTRUCTION OF ROADS, ALASKA

6 For construction of roads, tramways, buildings, ferries,
 7 bridges, and trails, including surveys and plans for new road
 8 construction; acquisition of lands or interests in lands by
 9 purchase, donation, condemnation, or otherwise; to remain
 10 available until expended, \$20,000,000, ~~(112)~~of which not
 11 to exceed \$2,493,000 shall be available for personal services,
 12 and of which not to exceed \$8,000,000 is for liquidation of
 13 obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted.

14 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF ROADS, ALASKA

15 For operation and maintenance of roads, tramways,
 16 buildings, ferries, bridges, and trails, ~~(113)\$2,600,000~~
 17 \$2,900,000 ~~(114)~~, of which not to exceed \$1,935,840 shall
 18 be available for personal services.

19 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

20 The total of the amounts herein appropriated for con-
 21 struction, operation and maintenance of roads in Alaska shall
 22 be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein
 23 made for operation and maintenance shall be available only
 24 for the service of the current fiscal year.

25 Not to exceed ~~(115)25~~ 20 per centum of the amount

1 herein appropriated for construction of roads in Alaska shall
2 be available for construction work by force account, or on a
3 hired labor basis.

4 CONSTRUCTION, ALASKA RAILROAD

5 For the authorized work of the Alaska Railroad, includ-
6 ing improvements and new construction, to remain available
7 until expended, \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That funds appro-
8 priated under this head may be transferred to the Alaska
9 Railroad Special Fund for purposes of accounting and
10 administration.

11 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ALASKA RAILROAD

12 The Alaska Railroad Special Fund shall continue avail-
13 able until expended for the work authorized by law, includ-
14 ing operation of facilities under the jurisdiction of the railroad
15 in Mount McKinley National Park; operation and mainte-
16 nance of oceangoing or coastwise vessels by ownership, char-
17 ter, or arrangement with other branches of the Government
18 service, for the purpose of providing additional facilities for
19 transportation of freight, passengers, or mail, when deemed
20 necessary for the benefit and development of industries or
21 travel in the area served; and payment of compensation and
22 expenses as authorized by section 42 of the Act of Septem-
23 ber 7, 1916 (5 U. S. C. 793), to be reimbursed as therein
24 provided: *Provided*, That no one other than the general
25 manager of said railroad, and one assistant general manager

1 at not to exceed \$13,000 per annum, shall be paid an annual
2 salary out of said fund of more than \$11,000.

3 VIRGIN ISLANDS PUBLIC WORKS

4 For an additional amount to carry out the provi-
5 sions of the Act of December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 827),
6 ~~(116)\$1,000,000~~ \$992,970 ~~(117)~~, of which not to exceed
7 \$63,270 shall be available for personal services: *Provided,*
8 That the estimated project costs specified in said Act of
9 December 20, 1944, shall not constitute limitations on
10 amounts that may be expended for such projects ~~(118)~~: *Pro-*
11 *vided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used*
12 *for the waterfront development project on Saint Thomas, and*
13 *the amount included in the 1952 budget estimates for this*
14 *project is hereby made available for school and hospital*
15 *facilities in the Virgin Islands.*

16 ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

17 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

18 For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary
19 of the Interior (referred to herein as the Secretary), includ-
20 ing teletype rentals and service; ~~(119)\$2,000,000~~ \$2,154,-
21 911 ~~(120)~~, of which not to exceed \$1,890,798 shall be
22 available for personal services.

23 GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

24 SEC. 102. Notwithstanding any provision of law to the
25 contrary, aliens may be employed during the current fiscal

1 year in the field service of the Department for periods of
2 not more than thirty days in cases of emergency caused by
3 fire, flood, storm, act of God, or sabotage.

4 SEC. 103. Appropriations in this Act available for
5 travel expenses shall be available, for expenses of attendance
6 of officers and employees at meetings or conventions of
7 members of societies or associations concerned with the work
8 of the bureau or office for which the appropriation concerned
9 is made.

10 SEC. 104. Appropriations made in this Act shall be
11 available for expenditure or transfer (within each
12 bureau or office), with the approval of the Secre-
13 tary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement
14 or repair of buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equip-
15 ment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other
16 unavoidable causes: *Provided*, That no funds shall be made
17 available under this authority until funds specifically made
18 available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies
19 shall have been exhausted.

20 SEC. 105. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure
21 or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropria-
22 tion in this Act, in addition to the amounts included in the
23 budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression
24 or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threat-
25 ening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the In-

1 terior: *Provided*, That appropriations made in this Act for
2 fire suppression purposes shall be available for the payment
3 of obligations incurred during the preceding fiscal year.

4 SEC. 106. Appropriations made in this Act shall be
5 available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and
6 similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will
7 contribute to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations
8 shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activ-
9 ity in the same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30
10 1932 (31 U. S. C. 686) : *Provided*, That reimbursements
11 for cost of supplies, materials and equipment, and for serv-
12 ices rendered may be credited to the appropriation current
13 at the time such reimbursements are received.

14 SEC. 107. Appropriations made in this Act shall be
15 available for services as authorized by section 15 of the
16 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) when authorized
17 by the Secretary; maintenance and operation of aircraft:
18 hire of passenger motor vehicles; examination of estimates
19 of appropriations in the field; payment for telephone service
20 in private residences in the field, when authorized under
21 regulations approved by the Secretary; and the payment
22 of dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library mem-
23 bership in societies or associations which issue publications
24 to members only or at a price to members lower than to
25 subscribers who are not members.

SEC. 108. The balances of all contract authorizations heretofore granted to the Interior Department or any of its bureaus or offices, which remain ~~(121)unused~~ *unobligated* on June 30, ~~(122)1951~~ 1952, are hereby rescinded ~~(123), except public works in the Virgin Islands.~~

~~(124)~~SEC. 109. *Transfers to the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 of property, other than real, excess to the needs of Federal agencies may be made at the request of the Secretary without reimbursement or transfer of funds when required by the Department for operations conducted in the Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.*

TITLE II—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

REVOLVING FUND

For an additional amount for the revolving fund established under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, to provide for advances to the Virgin Islands Corporation as authorized by law, ~~(125)\$1,800,000~~ \$2,595,000.

GRANTS .

For payment to the Virgin Islands Corporation in the form of grants, for expenses incurred during the current fiscal year, as authorized by section 8 of the Virgin Islands Corporation Act, in the conduct of activities budgeted as predominantly nonrevenue producing, \$130,000: *Provided,*

1 That funds appropriated under this head in the Interior
2 Department Appropriation Act, 1951, for estimated losses
3 to be sustained during the fiscal year 1951, shall remain
4 available for estimated losses to be sustained during the fiscal
5 year 1952: *Provided further*, That an amount equal to the
6 excess of grants for estimated losses for revenue producing
7 activities over the actual loss for the fiscal year 1951 and
8 the estimated loss for the fiscal year 1952 shall be trans-
9 ferred from the appropriation for "Grants" to the "Revolv-
10 ing Fund, Virgin Islands Corporation" and shall be merged
11 therewith.

12 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

13 During the current fiscal year the Virgin Islands Cor-
14 poration is hereby authorized to make such expenditures,
15 within the limits of funds available to it and in accord
16 with law, and to make such contracts and commitments
17 without regard to fiscal-year limitations as provided by
18 section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as
19 amended, as may be necessary in carrying out its programs
20 as set forth in the budget for the fiscal year 1952: *Provided*,
21 That not to exceed \$130,000 shall be available for adminis-
22 trative expenses (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the
23 Corporation, covering the categories set forth in the 1952
24 Budget estimates for such expenses.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(126) SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this Act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

SEC. 301. No part of the money appropriated by this Act or made available for expenditure by the Virgin Islands Corporation which is in excess of 75 per centum of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by the Department of the Interior or the Virgin Islands Corporation during such fiscal year in the performance of—

(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating,

1 inating public information publications or releases, radio
2 or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs,
3 motion pictures, and similar material,

4 shall be available to pay the compensation of persons per-
5 forming the functions described in (1) or (2).

6 **(127)**SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in
7 this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian
8 employee of the Government whose duties consist of acting
9 as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor ve-
10 hicle (other than a bus or ambulance), unless such appro-
11 priation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the
12 compensation of employees performing such duties.

13 **(128)**SEC. 303. No part of any appropriation contained in
14 this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any em-
15 ployee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that
16 would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one
17 hundred and fifteen, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time,
18 and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: Provided,
19 That for purposes of this section employees shall be consid-
20 ered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or
21 more in personnel administration consisting of direction and
22 administration of the personnel program; employment, place-
23 ment, and separation; job evaluation and classification; em-
24 ployee relations and services; training; committees of expert

1 examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage
2 administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

3 (129)SEC. 304. No part of any appropriation contained in
4 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
5 corporation included in this Act, shall be used to pay the
6 salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike
7 against the Government of the United States or who is a
8 member of an organization of Government employees that
9 asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United
10 States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization
11 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United
12 States by force or violence: Provided, That for the purposes
13 hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence
14 that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the
15 provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the
16 Government of the United States, is not a member of an
17 organization of Government employees that asserts the right
18 to strike against the Government of the United States, or
19 that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an
20 organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government
21 of the United States by force or violence: Provided further,
22 That any person who engages in a strike against the Govern-
23 ment of the United States or who is a member of an organi-
24 zation of Government employees that asserts the right to strike

1 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-
2 cates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates,
3 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force
4 or violence, and accepts employment the salary or wages for
5 which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained
6 in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction,
7 shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not
8 more than one year, or both: Provided further, That the above
9 penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution
10 for, any other provisions of existing law: Provided further,
11 That in cases of emergency, caused by fire, flood, storm, act
12 of God, or sabotage, persons may be employed for periods
13 of not more than thirty days and be paid salaries and wages
14 without the necessity of inquiring into their membership in
15 any organization.

16 (130)SEC. 305. During the last quarter of the fiscal year
17 1952, no greater amount may be obligated for the several
18 budget objects of expenditure, namely, 0-8, supplies and
19 materials, 0-9, equipment, and 0-10, lands and structures,
20 under each appropriation or authorization herein than the
21 average quarterly amount so obligated during the first three
22 quarters of such fiscal year unless the Director of the Budget
23 shall find in any particular case that the public interest re-
24 quires the obligation of the greater amount.

25 (131)SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation or authoriza-

1 tions contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compen-
 2 sation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or posi-
 3 tion which may become vacant during the fiscal year begin-
 4 ning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall
 5 not apply—

6 (a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;

7 (b) to positions filled from within the agency;

8 (c) to offices or positions required by law to be
 9 filled by appointment of the President by and with the
 10 advice and consent of the Senate;

11 (d) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel,
 12 including orderlies and school teachers in the Indian
 13 Service;

14 (e) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2;

15 (f) to law enforcement officers:

16 *Provided further*, That when any department or agency
 17 covered in this Act shall, as a result of the operation of this
 18 amendment, reduce their employment to a figure not ex-
 19 ceeding 80 per centum of the total number on their rolls
 20 as of July 1, 1951, such amendment shall cease to apply
 21 and said 80 per centum figure shall become a ceiling for
 22 employment during the fiscal year 1952 and if exceeded
 23 at any time during fiscal year 1952 this amendment shall
 24 again become operative.

25 *SEC. 306. In order to effect reductions equivalent to ten*

1 per cent or more in personal service budget estimates,
2 excepting operation and maintenance personnel, the following
3 reductions below the 1952 budget estimates have been made
4 in the following appropriations in the amounts indicated:

5 *Enforcement of Connally Hot Oil Act, \$15,330.*

6 *Power and energy studies, New England and New*
7 *York, \$24,100.*

8 *Southeastern Power Administration:*

9 *Construction, \$499,980.*

10 *Operation and maintenance, \$115,200.*

11 *Southwestern Power Administration:*

12 *Construction, \$65,200.*

13 *Operation and maintenance, \$44,288.*

14 *Commission of Fine Arts, \$2,015.*

15 *Bonneville Power Administration:*

16 *Construction, \$931,941.*

17 *Operation and maintenance, \$131,561.*

18 *Bureau of Land Management:*

19 *Management of Lands and Resources, \$326,295.*

20 *Construction, \$5,000.*

21 *Bureau of Indian Affairs:*

22 *Health, education, and welfare services,*
23 *\$164,100.*

24 *Resources management, \$451,140.*

25 *Construction, \$316,896.*

1 *General administrative expenses, \$299,253.*

2 *Payments to Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations,*
3 *\$2,345.*

4 *Bureau of Reclamation:*

5 *General investigations, \$351,488.*

6 *Construction and rehabilitation, \$3,240,045.*

7 *Operation and maintenance, \$116,406.*

8 *General administrative expenses, \$521,797.*

9 *Geological Survey:*

10 *Surveys, investigations and research, \$1,495,-*
11 *000.*

12 *Bureau of Mines:*

13 *Conservation and development of mineral re-*
14 *sources, \$1,112,797.*

15 *Construction, \$12,588.*

16 *General administrative expenses, \$113,159.*

17 *National Park Service:*

18 *Management and protection, \$414,936.*

19 *Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical fa-*
20 *cilities, \$26,710.*

21 *Construction, \$105,000.*

22 *General administrative expenses, \$112,726.*

23 *Fish and Wildlife Service:*

24 *Management of resources, \$191,804.*

25 *Investigations of resources, \$187,014.*

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 13, 1951

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the
Senate numbered

Article entitled "The China Lobby: A Case Study," published in Weekly Report for June 29, 1951, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

Editorial entitled "Little-Business Man, What Now?" published in the Oregonian of July 7, 1951.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

Address delivered by him before the National Convention of Young Republicans in Boston, Mass., June 29, 1951.

Article written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Times-Herald of July 1, 1951, discussing the address by Senator MCCARTHY on General Marshall.

Article written by George Sokolsky and published in the Washington Times-Herald of July 1, 1951, discussing the address by Senator MCCARTHY on General Marshall.

Editorial entitled "In Ignorance And," published in the Wisconsin State Journal of July 11, 1951, having reference to admission of newspaper correspondents to conference at Kaesong, Korea.

Editorial entitled "Comments by Crump," published in the Cambridge News, of Madison, Wis., of July 5, 1951, discussing relations between the State Department and Communists.

Editorial entitled "Senator MCCARTHY of Wisconsin," published in the Colton (Calif.) Courier and an editorial entitled "What Senator MCCARTHY Said About General Marshall," published in the Washington Times-Herald of June 24, 1951.

Excerpts from the files and letter from the Secretary of the Navy regarding the discharge of Lt. (j. g.) William Henry Evans, Jr.

Associated Press article entitled "Must Lift Government From Moral Morass, Senator BRAD Says," published in the Washington Evening Star.

Letter addressed by him to Hon. Hiram Bingham, Chairman of the Civil Service Loyalty Review Board, Civil Service Commission, dated July 13, 1951, making inquiry regarding investigation into the loyalty of State Department employees.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. There seemingly being no routine business to be transacted at this time, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hennings	McKellar
Bennett	Hill	Millikin
Bricker	Holland	Monroney
Bridges	Humphrey	Morse
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Neely
Byrd	Jenner	Nixon
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	O'Connor
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Case	Kefauver	Russell
Chavez	Kem	Saltonstall
Clements	Kerr	Schoepfel
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Langer	Stennis
Dworshak	Lehman	Thorpe
Eastland	Lodge	Underwood
Eaton	Long	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Welker
Frear	Malone	Wherry
Fulbright	Maybank	Williams
George	McCarthy	Young
Hayden	McClellan	
Hendrickson	McFarland	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOBY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], and the Sena-

tor from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

CONTROLS AND ROLL-BACKS ON BEEF

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, during the discussion of the defense-production bill, especially section IV, which had to do with price and wage controls, many observations were made with respect to controls on feeder cattle, especially replacement cattle. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] very forcefully stated the effect of premature marketing of cattle.

Of course, the control bill is out of the Senate. However, I am in receipt of a telegram today from an old friend of mine, a very loyal citizen of Nebraska, who has taken great interest in the production, feeding, finishing, and sale of livestock. He is Mr. J. J. Regan, the president of the Omaha Livestock Exchange. He has fed out thousands of head of cattle and has also helped to produce them on range land. By way of amplification of our arguments, I should like to read the telegram into the RECORD. I assure the present occupant of the chair that I do not expect to read the daily marketing reports on cattle, as was done in the days when the distinguished occupant of the chair was the majority leader of the Senate. I shall read only this telegram. It is as follows:

SOUTH OMAHA, NEBR., July 10, 1951.
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,

Senate Building:

Omaha cattle receipts for Monday and today number 25,000. This in comparison with Omaha's total cattle receipts all last week of 25,000, Chicago's 22,500, same period. Bulk of these cattle needing another 75 to 100 days' feed premature marketings cutting total available beef tonnage almost in half. Quick action in canceling controls and roll-backs on livestock and meats necessary to assure future consumer beef supplies.

J. J. REGAN,

President, Omaha Livestock Exchange.

I have inserted the telegram in the RECORD for the benefit of Senators. It comes from a very loyal citizen of Nebraska, who has been engaged not only in the production and feeding end, but in the selling and processing end as well. His judgment is worthy of consideration. As the House continues, and as we continue through the conference committee, to write a control bill which will accomplish the purpose of reducing the price of meat, it is my opinion and the opinion of Mr. Regan that controls and roll-backs on livestock should be canceled, because the chances for a decrease in prices are lessened if the production of meat is reduced.

DISCRIMINATORY FREIGHT RATES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of the existence of freight rates which are discriminatory against the South and the West in favor of the North and the East, especially the East, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks the paragraph in the Democratic platform for 1948 dealing with this subject. It reads:

We favor nondiscriminatory transportation charges and declare for the early correction of inequalities in such charges.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment on page 29, beginning in line 10.

On this question, 4 minutes are available to each side.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I sent to the desk a modification of my amendment, identified as "7-6-51-M," to the committee amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment to the committee amendment, and the modified amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 29, in line 11, it is proposed to strike out "\$17,587,203" and insert "\$16,858,603"; and in the same line it is proposed to strike out "\$10,639,175" and insert "\$10,446,575."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the reason for the modification of my amendment to the committee amendment is that after a discussion with some of the Senators from New England and a further examination of the record, I am withdrawing my proposal to strike the amount of \$100,000 from the bill.

The reason for the original amendment to strike out the amount of \$100,000 was that, as is shown in the President's letter of October 9, 1950, the study was to be a comprehensive study of land and water resources of this area, and should include, among other matters, coverage of electric-power generation and transmission, forest management, fish and wildlife conservation, flood control, mineral development, municipal and industrial water supplies, navigation, stream-pollution control, recreation, and soil conservation. The committee had struck out all provision for the comprehensive study except that covering the mineral deposits in New England. Inasmuch as we are now in war, Mr. President, I feel that if the Department of the Interior will confine the study strictly to the mineral survey, and will not attempt to make the so-called comprehensive survey, provision for which the committee struck out, then I have no objection to including the \$100,000 for the actual mineral survey.

On the other item, I am now sure that after last evening's session, the figure "\$16,858,603," in place of "\$17,587,203," which is the larger amount, less \$750,000, less \$21,400, which was taken out because of the 10-percent cut, will be agreed to by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have conferred with the Senator from Wyoming, and the committee will accept that amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. The other part of my amendment, as modified, which would carry the change through, namely, to strike out "\$10,639,175," and insert "\$10,446,575," I understand the committee will also accept, inasmuch as the amendment now provides for the 10-percent cut.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is an adjustment in the personnel cut.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment on page 29, beginning in line 10.

The modified amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to proceed for about 1 minute.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to state, with respect to the amendment which has just been adopted, that the report of the Director of De-

fense Mobilization, Mr. Wilson, submitted to the President on July 1, 1951, and a copy of which has been distributed to every Member of Congress, shows that there is a great need for the development of minerals. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will continue the efforts it has been making to stimulate the production of minerals within continental United States and within the possessions of the United States. The Bureau of Mines will be an important factor in this development. It may easily be that in order to carry out this objective it may be necessary for the Senate to consider additional appropriations for the Bureau of Mines before the year is out. I am confident that the funds carried in this bill are not sufficient for the purpose. In my opinion, Congress should leave nothing undone to promote the development of strategic and critical minerals in the United States.

To the Department of the Interior, through the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey, has been given the responsibility for a mineral supply adequate for the national security and for an expanding economy. When the current emergency led to the passage by Congress of the Defense Production Act of 1950, the Department of the Interior undertook the discharge of its new responsibilities through the creation of the Defense Minerals Administration and reorientation of the work of the two older agencies. A team has been created in the Department of the Interior which provides, first, for expanding mineral supply to meet immediate needs; second, for expanding reserves so that increased production did not lead to disastrous curtailment later; and, third, for the marking out of resources from which the production for a future generation could be expected with confidence. The integrated operations of the three agencies is intended to make possible an efficient operation which would not be possible if any one should be curtailed.

An agreement was reached among the heads of the three agencies on October 19, 1950, in which the fields of responsibility and the joint procedures of operation are laid out. Provision is made for a joint review of proposals for production expansion and other aids to the increase of supply. Such reviews are made in the light of the accumulated records of the two older agencies. Thus each project is subjected to the scrutiny of Defense Minerals staff members recruited from industry and exercising the practical business judgment of men borrowed from current mining operations, against a background of information and experience provided by the staff members of the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey whose approach is essentially technical and scientific. After the primary joint consideration of projects in Washington, those not eliminated by obvious noncompliance with the provisions of the Defense Production Act are referred to field teams on which only the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey are represented. The scientific and technical reports of these teams are returned to Washington for joint consid-

eration of committees chairmanned by DMA personnel supported by Bureau and Survey membership.

Typical of the conversion of the Department's long-range program in the development of mineral resources to expand supply for the current emergency is Defense Minerals Administration project to develop tin. As early as 1908 the Geological Survey published as bulletin 358, "Geology of the Seward Peninsula Tin Deposits, Alaska," in which the geology of the tin resources in the Seward Peninsula are described. In 1942 the Bureau of Mines in carrying out its program to develop ore reserves undertook a project on Cassiterite Creek. This included diamond drilling with the result that a large body of tin-bearing material was developed, but the low tin prices and the remote location of the property discouraged mining. However, with the advent of Defense Minerals Administration program of production loans, the United States Tin Corp. applied for assistance. The corporation's proposal was reviewed against the information accumulated by the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines, and a modified program was developed for which assistance to the extent of approximately \$400,000 in the form of a guaranteed loan was recommended. This loan has been made through private banking facilities and a crew has been recruited which began construction of facilities preparatory to production with the 1951 thaw. Shipments of tin and byproduct, tungsten, two of the most critical materials listed, are expected before transportation is arrested by winter. Moreover, operations are expected to be established so that work will continue and concentrates will accumulate during the winter months for shipment with the 1952 thaw.

Another example relates to a project for the bringing into production of the San Manuel copper ore body in Arizona. Here again the long-range programs of the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey are evidenced. In 1943 the Bureau of Mines, acting with the geologic advice of the Geological Survey, undertook a drilling campaign on a small copper-stained outcrop. As drilling proceeded, it developed that a huge ore body covered by recent sediments was beneath the small outcrop. The Bureau's drilling campaign was stopped when 110,000,000 tons of ore had been indicated, but development continued under private auspices until an ore body, the second largest in terms of copper content in the United States, had been proved. The owners were preparing for production when the Korean invasion so greatly increased the immediate need for copper. The Defense Minerals Administration, recognizing the possibilities for advancing the date of initial production and of increasing the production rate by underwriting some of the risks inherent in force-draft development, negotiated a supply contract with the owners.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment passed over will be stated.

The next amendment passed over was, under the subhead "Construction," on

page 30, line 8, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$1,250,000" and insert "\$1,587,412, of which not to exceed \$113,287 shall be available for personal services."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the agreement to the amendment on page 30, in lines 8 and 9, there may be inserted in the body of the RECORD the text of the testimony which I gave to the subcommittee in regard to this matter.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENTS OF HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WYOMING, AND THOMAS MILLER, ACTING DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF MINES, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ACCOMPANIED BY H. W. ST. CLAIR, CHIEF, LIGHT METALS BRANCH, BUREAU OF MINES, AND STEWART FRENCH, COUNSEL, SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

ALUMINA PLANT AT LARAMIE, WYO.

Senator HAYDEN, Senator O'MAHONEY, do you have any witnesses to present now?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a brief statement on a problem that has been previously handled by the full Appropriations Committee, namely, the completion of the alumina plant at Laramie, Wyo.

I will ask Mr. Miller, of the Bureau of Mines, and Mr. St. Clair to come up in case members of the committee might care to ask them any questions.

AMOUNT REQUESTED

It will be recalled that budget estimates were submitted to the Congress in House Documents Nos. 66 and 67. The budget estimate to which I refer is the one contained in House Document No. 67.

The estimate is as follows:

"BUREAU OF MINES

"CONSTRUCTION

"For an additional amount for 'Construction,' \$350,000, to remain available until expended. This estimate is necessary to provide funds for modifications and additions to a pilot plant constructed during World War II at Laramie, Wyo., so that research on the production of alumina from low-grade ores may be revived.

"It is desirable to develop processes for the production of alumina from low-grade raw materials found in abundant quantity in several areas of the United States, so that our dependence upon foreign supplies may be reduced."

RESTORATION REQUESTED

The other estimate, in Document 66, was \$750,000, for the operation of this plant. The Bureau of Mines asked for the restoration of that. That testimony does not interest me at the moment because, obviously, unless the plant is completed there will be no necessity of making any appropriation to operate it.

HISTORY OF LARAMIE PLANT REQUEST

I have taken the time to analyze all of the testimony that has been presented. In the interest of brevity and succinctness, I have reduced it to writing, Mr. Chairman, because I want the record to be quite clear with respect to the reasons why, in my opinion, this appropriation should be granted.

It will be recalled that I presented it to the full committee when the third supple-

mental bill was under consideration. The full committee approved the item for \$350,000, and later the Senate approved it. Thereafter, when we went to conference, it was rejected in the conference.

DEFENSE REQUIREMENTS

Spokesmen for the Interior Department subcommittee of the House seemed to be of the opinion that the expenditure at the present time was not justified by the facts.

However, I think the record clearly proves that it would be a great mistake if the plant were not completed.

I regard it as insurance for the country to have this plant completed so that tests may be made of domestic sources of alumina, thereby determining whether or not this country can be made independent, in case of emergency, of foreign sources of supply.

SUBMARINE DANGER

When, before the enactment of the Congressional Reorganization Act, I had charge of the stockpiling bill for the Military Affairs Committee, testimony was presented there that something like 52 vessels transporting bauxite from South America to the United States had been sunk at sea by German submarines.

We know now that the Russians have more submarines than the Germans had at that time.

So it is clear if there should be—and we all pray, of course, that there will not be—an armed conflict that will involve us and the Russians, these Russian submarines could cut us off just as surely as the German submarines did.

It was because of that fact that the War Production Board, during World War II, authorized the construction of four separate plants to test the alumina-bearing qualities of aluminous clays and rock throughout the United States.

In the case of the Laramie plant, the Bureau of Mines has made a finding of feasibility. It believes a scientific process has already been demonstrated. It will produce alumina.

The anorthosite rock which exists close by the Laramie, Wyo., plant contains tremendous quantities of alumina. The only purpose of this plant is to test whether or not that alumina can be made on an economic basis, whether the rock can be refined and the alumina extracted at a competitive cost.

NEED FOR LARAMIE PLANT

The argument in favor of this amendment is simple and direct. It may be presented briefly as follows:

1. The United States must expand its Air Force. Construction of an air fleet capable of long-range flight in such numbers and speed as to exceed the air power of any other nation is essential in the national defense.

2. It is impossible to build such an air force without using large quantities of aluminum.

3. The alumina from which aluminum is made is presently derived from bauxite.

Most of this bauxite comes from foreign sources of supply. Last year, before the aluminum-expansion program was undertaken, 65 percent of all bauxite used in the United States for the manufacture of alumina was imported.

EXTENT OF IMPORTATION

Now, under the expanded program, not less than 80 percent of the bauxite used in the United States will be brought from sources beyond the boundaries of this country.

In peace and in war, therefore, the United States is dependent upon foreign sources of supply for one of the most basic of all materials needed in the defense program.

4. Domestic sources of bauxite are limited, and if by any mischance of fortune the foreign sources of supply were cut off, we would be without a source of aluminum sufficient

to build the expanded air fleet so necessary to the protection of the United States.

Senator HAYDEN. As to that question of limited supply of bauxite in the United States, my recollection is, when this was discussed by the House, that the statements were made that there was much larger available supply of bauxite than had been heretofore anticipated.

DOMESTIC BAUXITE

Senator O'MAHONEY. That is why I had a search made of all the testimony.

The answer is given in the very next statement that I am to make to you.

5. For practical purposes, the only domestic deposits of bauxite in substantial quantities are to be found in the State of Arkansas. These Arkansas reserves, as of December 31, 1948, were estimated to total 66,600,000 tons of bauxite, of which only about 36,000,000 tons are of metallurgical grade.

Senator CHAVEZ. Do you mean that would be the total recapture?

Senator O'MAHONEY. No, sir; that is the bauxite. This is not the alumina. I am talking now in terms of bauxite. The alumina is much less, and I will refer to that in just a moment.

GRADES OF ORE

Senator HAYDEN. Let me see if I understand. There is a much larger body that has some alumina in it that could be extracted, but it in percentage is so low that it is not profitable to work it; is that correct?

Senator O'MAHONEY. It falls into different grades and categories. Yes.

Senator HAYDEN. Just like we have in a copper mine, some of the ore is richer.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The bauxite which is used for the production of alumina is called Bayer for some reason. Maybe Mr. Miller can tell us why.

BAYER PROCESSES OF REDUCTION

Mr. MILLER. That refers to the process. The Bayer process is the technical name of the process by which the bauxite is treated. The metallurgical bauxite is that which can be treated by the so-called Bayer process.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Then there is the grade called modified Bayer.

Mr. MILLER. That is a slightly lower grade ore. It contains a slightly higher percentage of silicon.

Senator HAYDEN. Which is the most expensive process to extract it?

Mr. MILLER. The modified process is more costly to extract than the straight original Bayer process.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Understand now, we are talking about removing alumina from bauxite.

The figures that I have given you are 66,600,000 tons of all kinds. Within that 66,600,000 tons, there are only 36,000,000 tons of metallurgical grade. That includes the Bayer and the modified Bayer.

In addition to those, however, there are other deposits which are designated as chemical or abrasive grade. There are some 4,600,000 tons of that.

Then there is high-iron bauxite, or submarginal bauxite, 26,000,000 tons, which cannot be refined in any existing plant.

The Bureau of Mines estimates that the alumina recoverable from all of this bauxite by existing processes is 18,000,000 tons.

This explains why it is that the aluminum companies are importing so large a percentage of their bauxite. It is because they get the high-grade bauxite, subject to processing by the Bayer process, from abroad.

Senator HAYDEN. How do these 18,000,000 tons compare with the annual importation?

Senator O'MAHONEY. We import 65 percent of all the bauxite that is used in ordinary operations, in peacetime operations.

NEED FOR FURTHER IMPORTS

The expanded program was a 500,000-ton increase, although the National Security Re-

sources Board recommended a 1,000,000-ton increase of aluminum production. With this 500,000-ton increase we are importing 80 percent.

That leads me to the reason why we should complete the laboratory in which we can determine the economy of making alumina from other domestic sources.

Senator CHAVEZ. Another point, Senator O'MAHONEY, is this: If through some emergency we were unable to import the bauxite from other countries, it might be necessary to go ahead and recapture what you are trying to recapture in Wyoming, no matter what it cost.

CONSTRUCTION OF LARAMIE ALUMINA PLANT

Senator O'MAHONEY. Precisely.

Now point No. 6: The completion of the Laramie alumina plant is essential in the national interest because it is located practically within sight of a huge deposit of anorthosite rock 30 miles in length and 10 to 18 miles wide and several thousand feet in thickness, which contains not less than 1,500,000,000 tons of alumina, at a minimum.

Moreover, when finished, this plant will be capable of testing most of the domestic clays, including the marginal bauxite deposits in Arkansas, which are not now capable of reduction in any existing plant.

WORLD WAR II EXPERIENCE

During World War II the domestic sources of bauxite were found to be wholly inadequate to supply the needs of the country. As a consequence, the War Production Board in 1942 and 1943 directed the Defense Plant Corporation, a subsidiary of the RFC, to construct several defense plants designed to make tests with respect to the possibilities of producing alumina, from domestic clays and rocks of various kinds. One of these plants was the one undertaken at Laramie because of the existence nearby of this huge deposit of anorthosite chiefly upon public land.

OTHER PLANTS

Three other plants using different raw materials and processes were constructed by the Defense Plant Corporation at approximately the same time—one at Salem, Oreg.; one at Harleyville, S. C.; and one at Salt Lake City, Utah.

After the end of hostilities, the Harleyville and Salt Lake City plants were sold; that at Salem, Oreg., was leased to a private company and changed over to the production of manganese dioxide of what is known as battery grade, a commodity that is on the list of critical materials. It is also producing ammonium sulfate, a needed fertilizer.

The Harleyville plant was sold to a cement company, and the machinery and equipment necessary for testing the alumina content of South Carolina clays were cannibalized. This facility is presently being used for the production of cement.

The plant at Salt Lake City was constructed for the purpose of testing a deposit of alunite in the State of Utah. These experiments were not successful, and the plant is now being used for the treatment of uranium materials found in Utah.

STATUS OF LARAMIE PLANT

The Laramie plant, among all of those constructed to make domestic sources of alumina available to the United States for defense purposes, is still the property of the United States Government, is not under lease, and is available for the purpose for which all four were built. It is the only one that is available. Approximately \$4,500,000 has been expended in its construction. It had not been completed when the shooting stopped.

The estimate of \$350,000 submitted by the Bureau of the Budget and urged by the Bureau of Mines is for the purpose of completing the plant.

FEASIBILITY OF LARAMIE PROCESS

There are two basic methods of producing alumina from the aluminous clays and rocks. One is the acid-leaching process which was attempted at the Salem, Oreg., plant. The other is an alkaline-leaching process, which was the process to be used at the Laramie plant.

The Bureau of Mines had made an unequivocal finding that the alkaline process is technically successful. If the Laramie plant is completed and put into operation, it will, therefore, provide for the United States the means to determine definitely whether or not alumina can be made at a reasonable cost from the unlimited deposits of anorthosite.

USES OF ALUMINUM

I have spoken chiefly of the use of aluminum for airplanes, but there are very many other most important uses. On page 814 of the hearings of the House Judiciary Committee, under Chairman Celler, there are listed 50 other military needs for which aluminum is required, including rockets and launching equipment, submarines, radar equipment, superbazookas, aircraft-landing mats, floating bridges, and airborne and other assault equipment of all kinds, not to mention the transportation facilities which are the basis of modern mobile warfare.

It was largely because of the lack of new sources of alumina, domestic sources of alumina, that during World War II many of these uses of aluminum had to be abandoned because we did not have enough.

Therefore, it seems to me to be completely clear that, in self-defense at least, we ought to complete the test and determine whether or not we are condemned to be dependent upon foreign sources for our supply.

ARKANSAS BAUXITE

As I have said, the Arkansas bauxite reserves classified as modified Bayer and estimated at 18,500,000 tons are capable of refinement in only one plant, that at Hurricane Creek, Ark., built by the Government during the war and afterward disposed of to Reynolds Metals Co.

There is no existing plant capable of refining the other marginal and submarginal metallurgical bauxite reserves. It is, therefore, necessary, before these bauxite reserves can be made usable, to conduct the same type of tests that are contemplated in the Laramie plant.

PLANT NOT IN COMPETITION WITH EXISTING PLANTS

The Laramie plant is not in any sense competitive with any other existing plant, private or public. It is only a demonstration plant. Completed and in full operation it would produce only 60 tons of alumina a day, but it will definitely demonstrate whether or not the United States must continue to be dependent upon foreign sources of supply, or whether the alumina clays known to exist in the United States, including low-grade bauxite, can be used to make the alumina which we must have to build the air fleet without which this country would be unable to keep pace with the expansion of Soviet air power.

This appropriation is insurance for the United States. If the tests prove that alumina can be made economically from anorthosite or from any other clay, not only will the United States be independent of foreign sources of supply but the door will be opened to the investment of private capital for the construction of new commercial plants to manufacture alumina in peace and war from domestic sources of supply.

If the appropriation is not granted, then the \$4,500,000 modern plant stands idle, not being used, at a time when it is clear that these tests ought to be made.

LIFE OF PRESENT BAUXITE SUPPLY

It has been estimated by the Bureau of Mines that if we depend entirely upon Arkansas bauxite for the production of alumina the supply would not last more than 8 years. Mr. Chairman, this is a specific reply to a question you asked a little bit earlier:

Responding to the question of Congressman JENSEN at the House hearing, page 105, Dr. Boyd, Director of the Bureau of Mines, said this:

"We said that there is 8 years' supply if we had to depend entirely upon Arkansas, but we would have to build a lot more alumina plants. That reserve would be sufficient for 8 years. But at the rate we are currently using these reserves they will last for 24 years."

That was the statement which led one of the conferees to say that there was a large supply of bauxite in Arkansas. But it is clear, from the exact language of Dr. Boyd, that he is referring to the rate at which we are currently using these reserves, which is the peacetime rate.

"That is closer to the normal economic life of an alumina plant. In other words, they can depend on those materials for a longer period of time as long as there are only two plants treating these ores. If we went in there to produce all-out from Arkansas, then those reserves would last only 8 years."

Senator HAYDEN. In other words, if the foreign source of bauxite were cut off, and we would have to depend entirely on the Arkansas supply, the Bureau of Mines states that it will last 8 years, and then we will have none?

Senator O'MAHONEY. That is right.

Senator HAYDEN. On the other hand, using it as supplemental to the importations at the present rate, it will last about 24 years. But even to do that, there must be construction of new plants.

COMPLETION COST OF LARAMIE PLANT

Senator O'MAHONEY. That would be the fact. You would have to build new plants.

And here is a system whereby we can finish, at a cost of \$350,000, a plant in which \$4,500,000 has already been spent and in which we could make tests of most of the aluminous clay in the United States which is subject to the alkaline test. It is particularly advantageous because of this tremendous deposit of anorthosite rock, the alumina content of which exceeds 2870.

I do not think it necessary for me to read the additional pages that I have written. I will give them to the clerk and ask him to put them in.

Senator HAYDEN. Very well.

(Material referred to is as follows:)

"Thus, the record shows that with the United States importing 65 percent of its peacetime requirements of bauxite, the Arkansas reserves would last for 24 years. Even the partially expanded alumina program, however, is calling for so much more alumina that it will require the importation of at least 80 percent of our bauxite needs. This can mean only one thing: If we were to be compelled to build the greatest air force in the world from the domestic supply of bauxite, we would have considerably less than 8 years' supply.

"The National Security Resources Board, late last year, recommended that the production of aluminum in the United States should be expanded by 1,000,000 tons a year. The present authorizations, however, account for an expansion of only 500,000 tons a year. It is clear, therefore, that we are not taking the steps necessary to produce the alumina which the National Security Resources Board believes we ought to have to build the sort of air force the defense of the Nation requires. In these circumstances, it seems to me unthinkable that we should fail

to finish this plant and immediately go about the task of trying to produce alumina from the clays we have within our own boundaries."

PLANT NOT EXPERIMENTAL

Senator O'MAHONEY. I would like again to make it clear that the Laramie plant would be experimental only in the sense of development of large-scale production on an economic basis, since the technical feasibility of the process is definitely established.

Mr. MILLER, am I not correct in interpreting the view of the Bureau of Mines that the process to be used is regarded as a successful process?

Mr. MILLER. You are entirely correct, sir.

ALKALINE PROCESS AT LARAMIE FEASIBLE

Mr. Chairman, I might say that all of the various proposals that have been made—and a number have been made—to try to produce alumina from various and sundry materials, the proposal we would undertake to carry out at Laramie is the most promising one of those ever suggested. It is the one nearest to being commercially successful.

Senator HAYDEN. The Arkansas bauxite development was originally instituted by the Bureau of Mines, was it not?

Mr. MILLER. The Bureau of Mines has, of course, been active in the development of additional reserves of bauxite in Arkansas, particularly during World War II.

As you probably remember, we had a very large exploration program on in Arkansas in an attempt to develop additional reserves of bauxite in 1942, and so on.

It was at that time that the detailed investigation of the total resources and the classification into these various groups by grades and so on were made.

When we talk about those reserves being available we assume the most favorable conditions, that is, that in the mining of the higher-grade material the lower-grade material is held in a condition to be recovered at a later date.

Some part of the 66,000,000 tons remaining in Arkansas probably cannot be mined economically.

BUREAU OF MINES' RESPONSIBILITY FOR PROGRESS

Senator HAYDEN. What I am trying to develop is that there would have been no development of bauxite-mining industry in Arkansas if the Bureau of Mines had not pioneered it.

Mr. MILLER. No. I believe the industry existed in Arkansas prior to the time the Bureau was actively engaged in that expanded program in World War II.

Senator HAYDEN. Is it true that now the bauxite is produced in Arkansas at a price that is comparable to imported bauxite, or is it cheaper?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; I believe that you could say that those mines that are now operating in Arkansas in producing metallurgical grade bauxite are doing so competitively with imported ore because the firms that are producing and consuming that material would have the alternative of buying foreign material. They are now buying some of the foreign ore and probably could buy more.

Senator HAYDEN. It would occur to me that it must be operated at a rate to encourage this American development in competition with the importation.

COST TO BE DETERMINED

Of course, you do not know until this plant is completed what it will cost to produce a pound or a ton of alumina in Wyoming.

Mr. MILLER. That is correct.

Senator HAYDEN. This experiment must be carried through.

Mr. MILLER. That is correct.

Senator HAYDEN. Then if it should develop that alumina could be produced on a

competitive basis with the importations, of course the industry could be expected naturally to expand very rapidly.

On the other hand, if it was more expensive to do that, we would simply feel that we would be warranted in paying the price as an insurance against summary loss.

COMPARISON WITH SYNTHETIC FUEL ACT

Senator O'MAHONEY. May I say the situation is very similar to that which existed when the Congress passed the Synthetic Fuel Act. I introduced that bill in the Senate; Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia, introduced it in the House.

The argument was made for a long time upon the part of industry, particularly the petroleum industry, that synthetic fuel could not be made from coal at any cost comparable to that under which it can be made from petroleum.

But in Germany the Hitlerites used the Fischer-Tropsch processes and some other process to make synthetic fuel from coal. They fought the war principally with synthetic fuel. Of course, it was more costly.

But after this plant was set up down in Louisiana, Mo., a Government ammonium plant which had been built for the war to produce ammonium was turned over to the Bureau of Mines for the hydrogenation of the coal. The progress has been so great that now the Bureau of Mines contends that liquid fuel can be made from coal practically at as low a cost as it could be made from petroleum when you take into consideration the return from byproducts.

BYPRODUCT FROM ALUMINA PLANT

Senator HAYDEN. Is there a byproduct in this case?

Senator O'MAHONEY. There is a byproduct in cement, yes.

Senator HAYDEN. Profit could be made out of that so that it would encourage private industry to go into business.

Senator O'MAHONEY. That is right.

But I want to have it perfectly clear that here is a perfectly feasible chemical process.

Secondly, there is a huge deposit containing a vast amount of aluminum, and if this process is commercially successful it would make the United States independent of any foreign source of supply in peacetime.

But since the process is feasible and if we should be cut off in wartime, it would assure us the alumina that we would need for emergency purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment heretofore passed over will be stated.

The next amendment passed over was, under the subhead "Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities," on page 32, line 22, after the word "Service," to strike out "\$7,300,000" and insert "\$7,369,790, of which not to exceed \$4,193,747 shall be available for personal services."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next committee amendment previously passed over will be stated.

The next amendment passed over was, under the subhead "Investigations of resources," on page 35, line 4, after the word "law," to strike out "\$3,875,000" and insert "\$3,858,986, of which not to exceed \$2,487,629 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for investigations, surveys, studies, trapping or similar work in foreign countries."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield a few minutes to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, while discussing this appropriation item, I wish to direct attention to the proviso appearing on page 35, at line 5. It bars the use of any part of this appropriation item for "investigations, surveys, studies, trapping or similar work in foreign countries."

The reason for inserting that provision was a release dated Monday, June 18, 1950, from the Department of the Interior, Information Service, Fish and Wildlife Service. It is headed "Dr. Bump to Import Game Birds From Middle East." It said that the Department now had a representative in the Middle East trapping birds, and making a study of the various species there, and that in time they would import these birds to the United States.

I now ask that the release be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. BUMP TO IMPORT GAME BIRDS FROM MIDDLE EAST

The introduction of desert-bred game birds from the Middle East to similar localities in this country is approaching realization, the Department of the Interior announced today. This summer the Fish and Wildlife Service is again sending its foreign game-bird specialist, Dr. Gardiner Bump, to Turkey, Syria, Iraq, and also Iran, if conditions permit, to trap certain species of nonmigratory game birds for shipment to the United States.

In 1950 Dr. Bump spent 6 months in middle eastern deserts and mountains studying and collecting desirable species not destructive to crops or native birds. During this time he found four species worth a trial introduction in parts of the West and Southwest. Last month he made a thorough inspection of Southwestern habitats where the birds will be eventually liberated.

Scheduled to leave this country on June 24, Dr. Bump plans to spend 6 to 8 months live trapping from 200 to 500 of each species selected. To guard against disease these birds will be quarantined for 1 month overseas, then shipped by Scandinavian Airlines to New York City. There they will go through 3 weeks' quarantine at the United States Bureau of Animal Industry's station at Clifton, N. J. Then they are sent to the carefully selected areas in New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah chosen in cooperation with the game departments of each State. Selection of these sites was based on similarity of topography, water quantity, climate, and food supply with those of countries in which the birds now live.

The Fish and Wildlife Service, the Wildlife Management Institute, and the State game commissions will work under a cooperative agreement insuring close scientific control for the new inhabitants.

In this way, the importation of foreign game birds is more likely to succeed than other large-scale attempts in the past which lacked adequate biological research and proper habitat investigation.

Chukar partridge—an ideal hunting bird because of its fast flight—is to be caught in Turkey and Syria. Oriental sand grouse, related to the pigeon family, will come from

the vast plains and uplands of Anatolia, Turkey. Sand partridge, or seese, will be trapped in northern Iraq (Mesopotamia). This bird makes the best eating of the four species. It is like our quail in size.

Most beautiful bird will be the black partridge, or francolin, which sports a silky black breast spotted with dashes of white. They are found in the historically ancient valleys of Euphrates and Tigris Rivers near fabled Babylon in Iraq.

Dr. Bump's assistant will be James Cox, a State biologist of New Mexico. He will help in trapping and care of those birds earmarked for importation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am sure the committee did not desire to be spending money on projects such as this, particularly in view of the cost of making such investigations in foreign countries. Therefore, we inserted the proviso in the bill. The proviso was inserted as a means of barring a bird-trapping expedition in the Near East, which had come to the attention of the committee through the press release which I have had printed in the RECORD. Further inquiry has developed that this particular project, under a Dr. Bump, would not be financed out of the appropriation now being considered. Rather, it would be financed out of funds reverting from a permanent indefinite appropriation to aid the States in wildlife development.

It also appears that this proviso in its present form may seriously jeopardize some of the work of the Fish and Wildlife Service in connection with migratory birds, by limiting activities in Canada and Mexico.

The Senator from Michigan did not intend to move for the deletion of this proviso, because I believe it has merit in shutting off activities like the Bump expedition, but I hope that in conference the provision may be modified so as not to apply to any essential activities in Central and North America, and I am sure that can be worked out.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator will recall that I actively supported his amendment in the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I did so because I was familiar with what the Fish and Wildlife Service had been doing in Europe, which I did not approve. Year before last I called attention to the experiment of sending Dr. Gardiner Bump to Europe to collect exotic species of birds and bring them back to this country. I did not consider that to be a practical activity, and I had hoped the Service would abandon it. Instead of that, they sent him to Europe, and he returned with a few birds. I do not know what they call them. They are black birds, but they are not what we call "blackbirds." They were released in Wisconsin. Sixty of them were put on an island, after the island had been thoroughly decontaminated of all predators, and a habitat with conditions which they said were similar to conditions in Scandinavia was provided for the birds. Sixty of them were put there, as I have said.

I do not know how many were kept in captivity in the hope that they would breed. The report I have is that of the 60 which were released on the island, some of them are already dead. I have not any hope of the birds breeding in captivity, and I do not believe there will be any substantial accretion of their number, but if there should be, they will be released.

I shall have available within a few days the figures as to what each one of those birds cost. I am told it will be over \$1,000 apiece. I simply did not want to see the money of the sportsmen and of the taxpayers wasted in that way, and that is why I was very anxious to see this amendment adopted, so that trapping and so-called research experiments could not be carried on all over the world.

Everyone who knows anything about wildlife conservation is aware that the aim of every State game department should be to ascertain how the native species have lived in accordance with natural laws; and when the habitat conditions which nature once provided, at a time when a particular species was plentiful, have been changed, to try then to get the habitat back to the original condition, but centering the efforts on species God put in this country, not what He put in Africa, not what He put in Egypt, not what He put in Turkey, or some other foreign place, where certain species may be well suited for conditions there but not so well suited to our country.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Is it not true that the importation of the Chinese pheasant into this country has been a great success?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Chinese pheasant, brought into California and eventually into the Dakotas, and a limited experiment in Oregon and Washington in connection with Hungarian partridges, were the two exceptions, so far as the Senator from Virginia knows, which proved the rule that the endeavor to introduce exotic species into this country is not profitable.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Will not the Senator from Virginia bear with me in correcting the statement about the Chinese pheasant being a bird which was brought into the State of California? If my information is correct, Chinese pheasants were first brought into the State of Oregon, and from there to the State of Idaho, with a smattering in the State of California. Idaho abounds in Chinese pheasants and also Hungarian partridges.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The article which the Senator from Virginia read, among other things, was either about a businessman or a missionary, I forget which, who returned to California with some Chinese pheasants.

Mr. WELKER. And to Oregon.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But, because there is honor enough for all, the Senator from Virginia is very glad to be cor-

rected, with respect to both Idaho and Oregon taking precedence over California, and to say that North Dakota and South Dakota have outstripped all other States in the production of such game birds.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to advise Senators that the time being occupied by the Senator from Virginia is being charged to the Senator from Michigan, who yielded to him.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. How much time does the Senator from Michigan have left, and how much time does the Senator from Arizona have left?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan has 7 minutes; the Senator from Arizona has not used any of his time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me for 1 minute?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia what the object is in having blackbirds shipped to the West. Blackbirds are not needed in the West, are they?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The birds are black in color. The Senator from Virginia has not learned their ornithological name. They come from Scandinavia. I understand they are larger than the prairie chicken, with which the Senator may be familiar, and the ruffed grouse, in Virginia, or the partridge, in New England. They are not so large as turkeys, but are supposed to be fine game birds.

Mr. WHERRY. They are fine game birds, and the purpose is to populate this country with them.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. They were put into Wisconsin, where the climate is somewhat cold, as it is in Scandinavia. They were put on an island where they could be protected from predators.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. The Chinese pheasants were taken to Oregon, and they migrated to the Dakotas. I desire to add that Nebraska has produced Chinese pheasants, and that each year, we welcome to Nebraska a host of hunters from all over the United States.

We do not want to be in the position of opposing the sending of these birds to Wisconsin. We should like to have more birds in Nebraska, but we want game birds. We do not want blackbirds, and we do not want any more crows. We have plenty of crows.

Mr. ROBERTSON. If the Senator from Nebraska will import some Virginia bobwhite quail into his State he will have a real game bird.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator from Virginia realizes that not all the experiments in wildlife are as unsuccessful as is the one he has in mind. For example, a private citizen of the State of Louisiana had the idea that it would be well to bring over from a foreign country an animal similar to the Louisiana muskrat, and that by proper breeding a much larger pelt might be produced. The experiment was tried, and it proved very successful.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not deprecate the advantage of research and experimentation in exact as well as in inexact science, but I think some discretion should be used. I think bringing in exotic species of birds is an abuse of discretion.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will this bill help to get rid of magpies?

Mr. ROBERTSON. There is a provision in it with reference to predators, and if magpies in the Senator's State are predatory birds they might be included.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Is it true that Johnson grass, which is a great pest in many sections of the country, was brought in under similar circumstances?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think it was. Many experiments have been tried. The German carp was brought into this country, and it has spread all over the United States. That was a terrible mistake. Someone brought the English sparrow to this country, and the English sparrow never did anyone any good. Someone brought the starlings to this country. That was a poor experiment.

Mr. KEM. It indicates the necessity for caution.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, may we have a vote on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment heretofore passed over.

The next amendment passed over was, under the subhead "Office of Territories—Administration of Territories," on page 37, after line 8, to strike out:

For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, for expenditure as authorized by law, \$7,020,000.

And in lieu thereof, to insert the following:

For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including expenses of the offices of the Governors of Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, as authorized by 48 U. S. C., secs. 61, 531, 1422, 1431a (d), expenses of the Government

of the Virgin Islands including the agricultural station, as authorized by law (48 U. S. C. 1405, 7 U. S. C. 386g), and expenses of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands appointed pursuant to the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress; compensation and mileage of members of the legislatures in Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and American Samoa, as authorized by law (48 U. S. C., secs. 87, 539, 1421d (e), and 1431a (c)); compensation and expenses of the judiciary in American Samoa as authorized by law (48 U. S. C. 1431a (c)) and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress; care of insane as authorized by law for Alaska (48 U. S. C. 46-50); grants to the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, in addition to current local revenues, for support of governmental functions; and not to exceed \$50,000 for personal services, household equipment and furnishings, and utilities necessary in the operation of the several Governors' houses; \$7,020,000, of which not to exceed \$811,865 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That the Territorial and local governments of the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands are authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That appropriations available for the Administration of Territories, including the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, may be expended for the purchase, maintenance, and operation of not to exceed four aircraft, 1 AK and 6 AKL type surface vessels, and such minor vessels as may be required, for official purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found by the Secretary to be necessary in carrying out the provisions of Article 6 (2) of the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I had indicated to the chairman of the subcommittee that I held some reservations toward the appropriation item appearing on page 37, for the administration of Territories. I am particularly interested in the appropriation for the so-called trust territories.

I do not intend to offer a specific amendment at this time. For one thing, the committee has made a substantial reduction from the budget figure. However, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee for an explanation of the item so that it may be in the RECORD. It is a new appropriation, and it is one without express authorization in law, which made it subject to a point of order in the House.

Also, I should like to invite the chairman's particular attention to the fact that this appropriation, on page 38, line 9, is "in addition to current local revenues." As I understand, those local revenues are relatively modest, amounting to something like \$250,000 a year. However, I have noted in the hearings that those local revenues are not accounted for separately and are commingled with this appropriation. Would the chairman of the committee agree with me that particularly since we are here starting a new administrative program this commingling of local revenues

was undesirable? Is it not possible that we could inform the High Commissioner of the trust territories that these revenues should be kept separate for accounting purposes and perhaps earmarked for some specific purpose? I make that suggestion not only in the interests of the United States Government, which in effect has become the trustee of those receipts, but in the interests of the natives who, I think, should be able to know where their own contributions go.

Mr. HAYDEN. There was some discussion of this question in the committee when we had under consideration the appropriation and the authorization. It is true that a number of instances may be found of local taxes being levied to aid in carrying on the government. The local people should contribute as much as they possibly can, but they cannot undertake to do all the work. Whether it is possible to do more than clearly to indicate through the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress each year how much is realized from those sources I do not know. Whether a separate set of books should be kept, I am not sure.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to say to the Senator from Michigan that the administration of trust territories comes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It will be recalled that under the trusteeship agreement, under the United Nations, the United States was given administrative control of those areas. The Navy Department handled them from the end of the war until an Executive order was issued on the 29th of June transferring the administration from the Department of the Navy to the Department of the Interior. The allowance which has been made by the committee for the trust territories in the Pacific and for American Samoa is approximately 40 percent less than was expended in 1950 by the Navy in the administration of those areas.

As chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I have requested the Bureau of Territories in the Department of the Interior to make a full report, which report will include the proposed method of handling the local revenues. Necessarily, we shall have to have some legislation fixing a rule for the administration of these Territories.

I think I can assure the Senator that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs realizes the necessity of substituting a rule of law for the Executive order, which of course does not give detailed consideration to the administration of revenue.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. My information is substantially in accord with the statement just made by the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I am glad the chairman of that committee is also a member of the Defense Subcommittee on Appropria-

tions, and I hope he will keep an eagle eye on the estimates, and be sure that the amount of money heretofore appropriated to the Navy for the administration of the islands is not buried somewhere in the appropriation, but is eliminated from it.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Why has not legislation been proposed for the purpose of authorizing the trusteeship?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The only answer I can make to that question is that neither the chairman of the committee nor any of the members of the committee have had the time to give very much attention to the matter in this session of Congress. The Department of the Interior is just beginning to get the details in order. I expect that before the present calendar year has passed we shall have some legislative suggestions. I think we should afford the Bureau time to develop mature recommendations.

Mr. WATKINS. I am not opposed to this particular item, but I think it is legislation on an appropriation bill and is subject to a point of order.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am not suggesting inserting it; I am merely calling it to the attention of the Senate and of the chairman of the committee. The chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has taken the challenge, and agrees that something should be done in connection with this subject.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I shall not oppose the item, although I think it is subject to a point of order. However, I wish to say to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that I hope the action now proposed will not be taken as a precedent in the future. I hope it will not be said, "Well, we have authorized such action once, and we should continue it without passing authorizing legislation on the subject."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. It is completely understood to be a temporary expedient. There can be no question about that.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I wish first of all to say to the Senator from Michigan that I think his point is very well taken that there should be a separation of the funds provided by the Government and by the local entities. If there should be a commingling of the funds trouble will be encountered. The Senator from Michigan is on sound ground in the position he has taken. We had trouble a few years ago when the funds provided for the Canal Zone and the Panama Railroad were commingled. At that time the mingling of funds made it impossible to reconcile the cash account. Therefore we ought to get away from mingling funds. It ought to be understood in connection with the adoption of the provision that it is the sense of the Senate that the funds should be kept separate in bookkeeping and not mingled.

I should now like to ask the Senator a question with respect to language begin-

ning in line 24 on page 37, which reads "Compensation and mileage of members of the legislatures in Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and American Samoa." Does the language provide the money for compensation of members of the Legislatures of Alaska and Hawaii?

Mr. FERGUSON. As I understand it is authorized by law, Forty-eighth United States Code, sections 87, 599, and 1421d (e), and 1431a (c). So the compensation and mileage for members of the legislatures in these various Territories and districts are absolutely specified in the language of the committee amendment.

Mr. CASE. I may say, then, that I hope the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs when it comes to draft legislation on this subject, will give consideration to providing that the compensation and mileage of members of Territorial legislatures shall be paid out of the revenues of the Territories rather than out of the Treasury of the United States.

My further question relates to an item that appears on page 38. In lines 23 and 24 the language would make this fund available for the purchase of certain aircraft, and then "such minor vessels as may be required, for official purposes and for commercial transportation purposes."

It occurs to me that with the number of ships we have tied up in the moth-ball fleet, some of the slower cargo ships which were declared to be surplus following World War II could well be used for commercial transportation purposes, rather than providing money for buying new ships. Would it not be possible to use some of the cargo ships which were placed in the moth-ball fleet?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me so I may answer the suggestion made by the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon raised the same two questions in the committee hearings, and made inquiries thereafter to determine the facts with respect to the provisions on page 38 in lines 22, 23, and 24. The information is to the effect that the civilian government administration has taken over substantially the equipment the Navy was using for the same purposes and will continue to use that equipment. There may be one or two minor exceptions. I think the authority provided here is for a bookkeeping transaction between the Department of Defense and the Interior Department with respect to equipment heretofore used in the areas by the Navy when it had charge of the civil government, and now to be transferred to and used by the Interior Department and its administration of the civil government.

We also made inquiry in respect to the operation by the Interior Department of transportation service for commercial purposes. It seems to the Senator from Oregon that such commercial operation ought to be by private industries, as elsewhere. The information secured is that there now are in process of negotiation contracts by which these vessels will be transferred, first by lease, and later by sale, to private industry, so

that the commercial transportation aspects can be ultimately fully divorced from the governmental administration.

Mr. CASE. So that the use of the word "purchase" here refers probably to purchase from the other Government agency?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct. It is actually, as I understand, nothing but a transfer of jurisdiction from one agency to another of property the title to which is in the Federal Government. But the fashion nowadays is for each employee of Uncle Sam to consider that he owns that which he administers and has a right to convey title when somebody else administers it.

Mr. CASE. The junior Senator from South Dakota wishes to say that he is glad to know that the committee went into that matter, and trusts that by calling attention to it here, the matter will not be forgotten, and that in the operations of the staff of the Appropriations Committee, steps will be taken to see that the practice to be observed under the broad authority provided in this language is carried out in keeping with the spirit of the proposed operation suggested by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. CORDON. My attention has been called to section 109 of the bill, on page 44, which contains specific authority for the making of these transfers from the Department of Defense to the Department of the Interior, and provides for such transfer without actual payment of money.

Mr. CASE. I am looking now at that language to which the Senator has directed attention, and it does provide that that transfer can be made without reimbursement or transfer of funds.

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

Mr. CASE. In view of that, is the word "purchase" necessary in line 21 on page 38?

Mr. CORDON. It is not necessary, I think, with reference to all the equipment. There may be some exceptions, and I would hesitate to change the word "purchase" to "transfer", because there may be, with respect to minor craft, some purchases necessary. I cannot answer the Senator on that point. I do not know.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota has been quite concerned in the past few days, in connection with the consideration of this bill and other bills, in going through items relating to various agencies and noticing amendments striking the language which would permit the purchase of automobiles or, in many instances, reducing the appropriations therefor. It would seem a little strange that in this case we should provide an appropriation of \$7,000,000 without any specific allocation of that amount, and make it possible for that money to be used for aircraft and minor vessels, unless the record is clarified in that respect. The matter having been discussed here, and since this language will come up in conference, prior to the conference which will be held on this bill the staff of the committee might properly give a little more specific informa-

tion on this provision, and if adjustments can be made, they may be made in conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say that the language which is before the Senate in the committee amendment was worked out by the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Wyoming in conference with the legislative drafting service of the Senate, and after conference with the Bureau of Territories of the Department of the Interior. I should like to assure the Senator from South Dakota that this matter is going to be under constant scrutiny by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The Department of the Interior has already been requested to submit complete information with respect to every function of the administration. The greatest assurance the Senate has that there will be no waste in this fund lies in the fact that the cost of administration of the trust territories—which, by the way, was provided for in the trust agreement approved during the Eightieth Congress—is 40 percent less than the cost last year. We have already indicated our desire to hold this expenditure down. I think the Senator from South Dakota and all other Members of the Senate may rest quite assured that nothing will be overlooked in this connection. We must have a basic law under which to administer these trust territories, and we must have a strict bookkeeping account of all local revenue.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for one more question.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota does not want to labor the matter—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield 1 minute.

Mr. CASE. We have been examining requests for the purchase of automobiles in the case of some of our domestic agencies such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Service Commission, and other agencies which may have total appropriations of less than \$1,000,000. We have reduced the number of cars by amendments on the floor. Here is an appropriation totaling more than \$7,000,000. Obviously much of it must be used for other purposes; but it is a much larger appropriation than is made for certain other agencies. We put in a blanket authorization for the purchase of aircraft and minor vessels. Without the assurances which have been given as a result of this colloquy it would seem on the face of it that the door is left wide open.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this is not a blanket authorization. We put in a specific limitation. The authorization is "for the purchase, maintenance, and operation of not to exceed four aircraft, one AK and six AKL type surface vessels"—

Mr. CASE. And "such minor vessels as may be required, for official purposes

and for commercial transportation purposes."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We used the word "minor" in order to describe minor vessels which it would be impossible to describe otherwise.

Mr. CASE. The number might be 50 or 100. If we are going to limit the number of automobiles which an agency can use, we might well limit the number of minor vessels.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I can assure the Senator that the expenditures required for other important administrative details are so great that there will be no money left for any waste in the purchase of pleasure vessels.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan has farmed out all his time, and has not had any time for himself.

A survey was made of these items, and I am satisfied that the committee did a good job in this particular case. For example, \$314,600 was asked for furniture. The committee specifically limited that item to \$50,000, indicating that there was an attempt really to do the job.

The reason why this matter is called to the attention of the Senate and of the chairman by the Senator from Michigan is in order that the conferees may be informed, and that all parties interested may see that in the coming year something is done about accounting for the funds, so that there will be no commingling of funds. Otherwise the natives who pay taxes might claim that the money was being used in the operation of headquarters, or for some other purpose, when it was being used for a different purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 37, beginning in line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

The next committee amendment passed over was, on page 42, line 5, to strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert "\$2,154,911, of which not to exceed \$1,890,798 shall be available for personal services."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona explain why this amount was increased?

Mr. HAYDEN. We took 10 percent off the budget estimate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How does the number of employees proposed compare with the number of employees in the Office of the Secretary for the past several years?

Mr. HAYDEN. Last year 408 employees were authorized. Under the budget estimate they would have 383, and we have made a 10-percent reduction under that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How many employees did this Department have 3 or 4 years ago? I notice that the over-all number of Interior Department employees has increased 20 or 25 percent over the number 2 or 3 years ago.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator wants my private personal opinion, I think it

is the part of wisdom to have a good staff under the Secretary so as properly to look after the activities of the several bureaus. But this is the way the appropriation has been set up. So far as I can remember, at no time were there more than this number of the Secretary's office. The Secretary's office has appealed to us to give it more help, but it has been getting less.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am inclined to agree with the Senator, because, according to the figures, at no time, at least in the past 10 years—and that is as far back as we have records available—has there been anywhere near the present number of employees in the Department of the Interior as they have today. Does the Department need so many more employees? Why does it need 20 percent more employees than it had a couple of years ago?

Mr. HAYDEN. It depends entirely on the activities in which the Department is engaged. If additional work is placed upon it, more employees are required. If there is less work, a reduction can be made in the number of employees.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What activities is the Department engaged in today that it did not have a couple of years ago? I am wondering if the Department needs so many employees.

Mr. HAYDEN. What the committee tried to determine was whether the Secretary's office could be operated on the basis of the budget estimate, which represents a reduction from 408 to 383 employees. The Secretary indicated that he would have trouble getting along. Then the Senate issued a directive to reduce personnel by 10 percent, which we have done. We have done just what the Senate required. We have taken 10 percent off the budget estimate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That still would leave 10 percent more than the Department had a couple of years ago. I am wondering why they need it.

Mr. HAYDEN. How could it be 10 percent more than it had? Last year there were 408 employees authorized for this office. The budget estimate is 383.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am speaking of the over-all number of employees in the Interior Department whether they are allocated to the Secretary's office or in the field. What new duties have they that require 10 percent more employees in the Department of the Interior today than there were several years ago?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is asking about the entire Department, and asking me to explain the details of each bureau.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am speaking of the Department of the Interior. This appropriation is for the Office of the Secretary of the Interior. I am not concerned with where the employees are allocated. I am wondering whether, in the over-all number of employees, the Department needs 10 percent more.

Mr. HAYDEN. I still cannot understand the Senator's query. He asks me, first, why the total number of employees in the Office of the Secretary has increased. He does not appear to understand that even under those circumstances there are fewer employees in the Secretary's office than there were last year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that. There are fewer employees in the Secretary's office this year than last year; but so far as the over-all number of employees is concerned, there are still 10 or 15 percent more than there were 2 or 3 years ago, and I am wondering why. The Secretary can allocate them where he pleases.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am not sure of that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. One of the reasons is this: A function heretofore performed by the Navy is now being performed by the Department of the Interior. I refer particularly to the trusteeships or mandates in the Pacific, which necessitate increased personnel.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Have there been any transfers from the Department of the Interior to some other department? I am merely asking for an explanation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The explanation is that if the Department of the Navy had functions to perform in connection with the mandated islands of the Pacific, which functions by law or executive order were transferred to the Department of the Interior, it is necessary for the Department of the Interior to have more personnel.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand, but in the reorganization have any functions been transferred from the Department of the Interior to some other department, such as the Navy?

Mr. HAYDEN. None that I know of.

Mr. WILLIAMS. None at all? Are you sure?

Mr. HAYDEN. In the case of Bonneville, more hydroelectric power plants have been finished and more transmission lines have been built, and consequently there has been more power to sell. Obviously it takes more people to operate the expanded facilities. The same thing is true in the case of the Southwestern Power Administration.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think it would be worth while to make known the fact that in the mobilization program there has been established, necessarily in the Department of the Interior, the Petroleum Administration for Defense and the Minerals and Energy Administration. Both organizations are at work on vital segments of our preparedness economy. The Munitions Board, for example, has called upon the petroleum industry of the United States to produce 1,000,000 barrels a day more of petroleum than was produced during last year. What that means will become apparent when one recalls that last year we were consuming in the United States more oil than was consumed, including military uses, even at the height of World War II.

The production of petroleum, the production and administration of synthetic fuel programs, the development of the minerals program, the latter of which I am sorry to say is not moving so rap-

idly as it should move, but which is highly essential in the public defense, require an administrative staff at the command of the Secretary of the Interior. If there were no other reason than that, I believe the action of the committee would be justified. The action of the committee cannot in any sense be regarded as being overgenerous. The committee was very economical.

Mr. HAYDEN. I believe the Senator from Delaware will understand that in the cases referred to by the Senator from Wyoming we tried to utilize personnel in the Department of the Interior which had a background of understanding of the defense effort. That is to say, there were employees in the Department who were familiar with oil and minerals. Additional duties have been imposed upon them, and the work must be supervised.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I cannot understand why it should take additional personnel. Perhaps there is a reason for it. However, if the Senator's reason is correct that it is caused by the Korean War, we should pay tribute to the Department of the Interior for its foresight in anticipating the outbreak of war in Korea, because the record shows it had increased its employees months before the war broke out. Are you trying to say that they anticipated the outbreak of the Korean War? That is what I am speaking about. It has many more employees than it had previously. I am not speaking only of the employees who have been added since the outbreak of the war. There may be fewer employees in a particular department than the Department had at the outbreak of the Korean War, but the Interior Department as a whole still has more employees than it had 2 years ago. I ask why? It cannot be charged to national defense. We had high productivity of oil and other minerals during World War II. Today there are from 20 to 25 percent more employees in the Department than during that war, and we are engaged only in a police action in Korea.

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee has paid attention to it. If the Senator from Delaware had attended the hearings he would have seen how closely we examined every bureau and agency in order to determine whether they are overstaffed, and what their functions were. It is all very well for the Senator from Delaware to sit in his office and say we should not have as many people in the Department of the Interior as we had before, without any basic knowledge on his part as to why it is necessary to have them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Delaware is an easterner who has been trying for a long time to gain membership on the Committee on Appropriations. There are only three Senators from the East who have been able to crash the sacred portals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 42, line 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to take up the last committee amendments.

We shall have to turn to page 18 of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

The next amendment passed over was, under the heading "Bureau of Reclamation—General investigations", on page 18, line 2, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$4,000,000", and insert "\$4,600,000, of which not to exceed \$3,163,396 shall be available for personal services, and."

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Utah gave notice that he did not desire to add any money to the bill, but he desired to make a statement at this time.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Originally I had planned to move to amend this section by increasing the amount of the Department's appropriation for general investigation and advanced planning, but I find that the point I had in mind has already been taken care of to a certain extent in the allocation by the Bureau of Reclamation to the various reclamation projects now in the advanced planning stages.

On the basis of the figure approved by the House for this item of \$4,000,000, the allotment for Weber Basin project would be \$248,000.

On the basis of the \$4,600,000, as recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee, the allotment would be \$280,000. I got these figures from the Bureau of Reclamation this morning.

I am serving notice on the Committee on Appropriations and the Senate that this will not be enough money to take care of advance planning on this project. I am not speaking of construction. Therefore, when the deficiency bill comes under consideration I expect to appear before the committee and ask for additional sums of money for this purpose, so that the planning can be properly taken care of in a reasonable time. I was not aware at the time that anything had been allowed for this particular project for advance planning. Since an allowance has been made and the \$4,600,000 is to stay in the bill I do not intend to offer my amendment at this time.

At this point I should like to have inserted in the Record telegrams which I have received from water users at Ogden and other places in the Weber Basin area.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OGDEN, UTAH, July 5, 1951.

Hon. ARTHUR W. WATKINS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

This district association comprising area of Weber Basin project stunned to learn Senate Appropriations Committee denied request for starting funds. Weber and Davis Counties concentrated population in critical position so far as ample available water is concerned. Tremendous increased population in this area has been supplied with water only because of above normal precipitation past 11 years. We surviving on borrowed time and serious consequences will result should there be dry cycle prior to building of Weber project that would make

us self-sufficient so far as water is concerned. Request you do all in your power to acquaint Senate with serious situation and grant us necessary relief.

JOSEPH W. JOHNSON,
President, Utah Water Users Association, District No. 2.

LAYTON, UTAH, July 5, 1951.

Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Washington, D. C.:

Water development urgently needed to protect the agricultural economy and war effort in Davis County.

DAVIS COUNTY WATER USERS
ASSOCIATION,
J. W. JOHNSON.

OGDEN, UTAH, July 5, 1951.

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

In denying construction money for Weber Basin project we confident Senate Appropriations Committee was not conscious serious irrigation and culinary water problem in Weber County which surviving only because above normal precipitation for number of years which record has not been repeated before in past 50 years. Weber County must continue increased production to assist in maintenance of tremendously increased population this area. We consider Weber project an emergency and in interest of national defense it must be completed at earliest possible date. Urge you do all possible that Senate may favorably consider our emergency.

ARLIE S. CAMPBELL,
President, Weber County Water Users Association.

OGDEN, UTAH, July 5, 1951.

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

The 10,800 employees of Ogden area military establishments who reside in Weber County, all supplied by domestic water from Ogden City or other small communities in the county, were all dependent upon small streams and artesian basin on Wasatch front. Research proves our usable underground water extremely limited because of chloride and sulfate infiltration from lower stratas into underground aquifers. Our survival to date has been possible because of unprecedented long periods of above-normal precipitation. One dry year, and Ogden would be short 10 second-feet during peak use. Ogden citizens shocked to learn Senate Appropriations Committee refused starting appropriation for Weber Basin project, which, when completed, will assure our citizens, many of whom are Government employees, an adequate water supply. Ogden, which is Utah's second largest city and metropolitan center of Weber Basin project, has requested 10,000 acre-feet water from first unit of project, and without earliest possible completion we are fearful Ogden area's part of preparedness and defense efforts would be tremendously handicapped if not totally eliminated. Urge you do all possible that Senate may realize our very serious condition so far as domestic water is concerned.

W. R. WHITE,
Mayor of Ogden City.

OGDEN, UTAH, July 5, 1951.

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

Twenty-three municipality members this organization were hopeful early relief from serious domestic water situation through starting appropriation for Weber Basin project as every community operating on inadequate water supply. One dry year would

reduce supply on Wasatch front by 60 percent and detrimentally affect total operations this area and extensive program of our military installations which are so important to national preparedness and defense. We are stunned to learn Senate Appropriations Committee denied starting funds for Weber Basin project and can only conclude they are not totally informed of our critical situation. Urge you continue your active plea for construction appropriation because time is of essence.

HAROLD E. ELLISON,
President, Davis and Weber Counties
Municipal Water Development
Association.

OGDEN, UTAH, July 5, 1951.

Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Water development committee of Ogden Chamber of Commerce tremendously disturbed to learn that Senate Appropriations Committee disapproved request for funds to initiate construction of Weber Basin project. Ogden's important strategic position as center of military activities of area makes it imperative that project get underway and completed at earliest possible date to avoid disaster that would surely come if we move into a dry cycle which is long over-due. Urge you double your efforts that Senate may become aware our serious situation.

O. C. HAMMOND,
President, Ogden Chamber of
Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 18, line 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment passed over will be stated.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 18, in line 4, after the word "which", to strike out "\$3,500,000" and insert "\$3,903,500."

Mr. HAYDEN. I believe the Senator from Oregon desires to offer an amendment.

Mr. CORDON. I shall offer an amendment when all committee amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, we are coming to the conclusion of the consideration of the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior. Much has been said with reference to economies. I attended the sessions of the subcommittee on the bill. I believe I am familiar with what is contained in the bill. It is my opinion that greater savings could have been made. I agreed to go along with the committee, and I shall carry out the agreement.

Certain functions of the Department of the Interior cannot be cut. Certain functions require the appropriations which the committee has recommended to the Senate. However, there is one Bureau which I believe can be cut in the future. I wish to invite the attention of the Members of the Senate to the Indian Bureau. The Indian Bureau has existed for many years, supposedly to serve the interests of the American Indian, and to work in his behalf and to protect his rights. I have been watching the appropriations of the Congress of the United States for this particular Bureau for the past 20 years. I have

seen the appropriations grow from \$22,000,000 in 1931 to approximately \$67,000,000 in the pending bill. At one time they were \$73,000,000.

It is time that the American people pay more attention to the American Indian than to the Indian Bureau. It is time that the Indian, who has certainly proved his worth as a citizen under trying circumstances, be given an opportunity to develop a little self-confidence.

So far as I am concerned, in the future it will be my purpose, in connection with appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, to vote for the things which will benefit the Indians, but not for the things which will benefit the Bureau. If we shall pay more attention to the Indian, and less attention to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, we shall save a great deal of money, even in connection with this bill.

The Indian deserves to be treated in the way that each one of us would like to be treated, namely, as a human being.

Mr. President, the Indian who, under this appropriation, is supposed to be protected, may be drafted into the Army or the Navy or the Marines; and if that occurs, within 3 or 4 months thereafter he is able to take care of himself under any circumstances, whether in fighting against the North Koreans, or the Chinese Communists. Therefore, Mr. President, we should permit the Indian to take care of himself in civil life.

The trouble with this situation is that there is too much Bureau of Indian Affairs. There is no trouble with the Indians of the United States; they are as strong and as loyal and as patriotic as any other Americans are. Many of the American Indians have died in the service of their country, and are buried beneath white crosses in foreign fields. However, some persons believe that it is necessary to have a bloodsucking bureau in Washington, supposedly for the purpose of doing some good for the Indians. The pending appropriation bill demonstrates the duplication of work that is done in supposedly trying to do something for the Indians.

In this connection, I wish to call attention to one particular item, namely, that relating to the employment service in the Department of Labor. Within the Department of Labor there is an employment agency or service, whose duty it is to go over the country and obtain employment for American citizens who are in need of employment. The Indians should come in that category. Less than 2 weeks ago this body passed the Department of Labor Appropriation bill—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes allotted to the Senator from New Mexico have expired.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Arizona if I may have 5 minutes more.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield 2 minutes more to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well; I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, as I was saying, less than 2 weeks ago the Senate passed the Department of Labor appropriation bill, and in that bill provision is made for an employment agency.

However, in connection with the Department of Interior appropriation bill, which now is before us, the Indian Bureau comes forward with what in my opinion is a request for a duplication of work. Of course, in the committee we cut the amount of the appropriation for this item. The budget estimate was \$1,644,800 for the purpose of placing Mr. Indian at work. Why cannot the Department of Labor take care of employment for the Indians? The Indians wish to be taken care of in the same way that other Americans are; the Indian does not wish to have that work duplicated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Fortunately, the committee reduced the appropriation for the item to \$500,000, although in my opinion it is \$500,000 too much.

Yes, Mr. President, the Indian is entitled to a job; but let us see that he has it under American circumstances, and let us see to it that the Indian is treated in the way that the rest of us would like to be treated. Let the Department of Labor find work for the Indian who is at Gallup, N. Mex., or Butte, Mont., or elsewhere. That should be done by the Department of Labor, instead of having the work duplicated.

After all, Mr. President, the only trouble with Mr. Indian is the Bureau of Indian Affairs. All that the Indian wants is water, health, education, and to be left alone. However, the Bureau of Indian Affairs is not leaving the Indian alone. The Bureau is even telling him whom he must hire as a lawyer, how to make a blanket, and even wants to tell him how to pound silver.

Mr. President, the Indian deserves better treatment. In these days when we are preaching freedom and liberty for others, certainly the Indian is entitled to American justice. That is what he wants. In giving it to him, we can also save a great deal of money in connection with this bill.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask that to revert to page 13 of the bill, and in that connection I offer the amendment which I have at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Montana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, after line 19, it is proposed to insert the following: "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for construction or repair of the Tongue River Indian Reservation electric line, Montana, but the Secretary is hereby authorized to enter into a reimbursable contract with the Tongue River Electric Cooperative, Inc., Montana, with respect to maintenance, operation, and subsequent transfer of ownership of said line."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I may say that this matter was presented to the committee, and the committee authorized the Senator from Montana to offer the amendment. I shall be glad to accept the amendment, on behalf of the committee.

Mr. ECTON. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is also authorized to offer an amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "7-3-51-A," and offer it, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. After the item relating to construction of access roads on the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, it is proposed to insert the following:

The last sentence of subsection (b) of title II of the act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 874), is amended to read as follows: "When the general fund in the Treasury has been fully reimbursed for the expenditures which were made charges against the Oregon and California land-grant fund, said 25 percent shall be covered annually, on or after June 30, into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

H. W. MORRISON

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for not more than 5 minutes?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Idaho desires to present another matter to the Senate, and I think there will be adequate time for that purpose, for I do not believe there is anything controversial in regard to my amendment. So I am glad to yield 5 minutes of my time to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his gracious act.

Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege, to correct an impression which went out through the West yesterday by virtue of the debate as set forth on pages 8218 and 8219 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday. I refer in particular to the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], my able and fine friend, and to the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and to the remarks of my colleague and friend, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The debate related to the proposition that E. W. Rising was an ex-employee of a construction company, and had been in Washington, lobbying and representing the interests of a construction company which wanted to build certain dams.

Mr. President [Mr. HUNT in the chair], you yourself know, inasmuch as you also come from the West, that the inference could be directed only toward Mr. H. W. Morrison, the head of the Morrison-Knudsen Construction Co., whose principal place of business is at Boise, Idaho, and who is one of the greatest and finest citizens Idaho ever has had. We of Idaho are proud of him and his company. Mr. Morrison happens to be the head of the largest construction company in the world, if you please. I knew him in my youth when he had one team of horses and a scraper, with which he started to erect the giant, free-enterprise edifice he has built; as I say, the largest construction company in the world.

The inference was left that Mr. Rising was here lobbying for that bill, in order that Mr. Morrison of the Morrison-Knudsen Co. might profit by building dams in the eight Western States. Nothing could be further from the truth. Mr. Morrison has 78 subsidiary corporations doing construction work all over the world. He is building installations in Afghanistan, in Iran, in Guam, on Wake Island, in Canada, in Alaska, and many other places. The man needs no lobbyist here. He needs no additional work.

I beg my distinguished friends to correct the inference which has gone out to my home State, that H. W. Morrison, one of Idaho's greatest citizens, would stoop so low as to send a representative to Washington to see whether he could get a little bit more business. By virtue of his past history, Mr. Morrison needs no correction of this statement in Idaho, but I am sure my able friends will join me in striking from the RECORD the inferences which were drawn, based upon fallacious information. Mr. Rising, as I will relate later, has never received more than four or five hundred dollars a year from Morrison-Knudsen Co.

Mr. Morrison heads that company and built vital defense bases all over the world. Seventy-eight of his employees were lined up and shot on Wake Island. He is legend in Idaho. He is a great man.

I think that inference about Mr. Rising being a lobbyist for a construction firm came to my able friends because of the fact that Mr. Morrison is probably one of the most public-spirited men in the entire West, as the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], now occupying the Chair, knows. Mr. Morrison happens to be president of the Southwestern Idaho water conservation project. Mr. Rising, the witness who testified and who was the subject of argument yesterday, happens to be a representative of that organization. But Mr. Morrison is the president. He is but one of a number of business and professional men, and men of all walks of life, of Idaho, who are on the board of directors of this project and who are interested in saving the economy of the Northwest through the conservation of its water and water resources.

I am not making any argument with respect to Mr. Rising. I know him to be a splendid man. I have known him since my childhood. I know he is interested in the development of the West. I know he is interested in preserving the sugar-beet industry of the Northwest and of the West, and I know that, for his services in that connection, he probably receives a fee, as he does when he works for the Southwestern Idaho water conservation project. I also know that he is a representative of the National Water Conservation Conference, for which he receives no pay. But I beg of my distinguished colleagues that they will be fair, as I am sure they will, and that they will strike from the RECORD any reference to the fact that Mr. Rising was an ex-employee of a construction firm, when the facts are that he has received never in excess of \$500 a year from Morrison-Knudsen Co. for helping them on errands such as handling their export

license and making collections from foreign countries. The statement in the RECORD with reference to Mr. Rising might lead to the inference that he was a paid lobbyist for Morrison-Knudsen to get irrigation contracts. I talked to Mr. Morrison last night on the telephone, and he assured me—and I believed him—that Mr. Rising has never at any time been on the payroll of the Morrison-Knudsen Co., but has received only trifling sums for errands done for this western firm here in Washington. I ask my friends, in honesty and fairness, to do what I have suggested for a great man of Idaho. He is a great man, and I proudly proclaim him to all the world as a man who, from a humble beginning, came to be the owner of the world's largest construction concern. I submit this to my friends, and ask that this error be corrected.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, before I discuss my amendment, I desire for a moment to advert to the statement made by the junior Senator from Idaho. I was not present when the matter in question was discussed on the floor. Had I been, I think I would probably have been one of those who made the erroneous statement with reference to the Morrison-Knudsen Co. In committee I had repeated the reports which had come to me with reference to the employment by Morrison-Knudsen Co. of Mr. Rising—either present or past employment. The statements were made to me by people who alleged they knew. They have been made to me since the matter was argued on the floor. But, as I say, I did not participate in the argument on the floor. I would have taken part had I not been detained downtown at the time the matter was under consideration. But I had repeated in committee the statements I had heard; so if there be guilt, at least I am guilty by association; and if it be true—and so far as I am concerned the statement of my colleague from Idaho imports verity—I shall change my statement, therefore, to say that, since we know there was not such employment or connection between this construction company and Mr. Rising, so far as I am concerned, at this moment, I desire to offer an apology to both, to the extent that I may have repeated a statement which did not convey the fact.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I merely want to state that I know Mr. Rising. I had some dealings with him when the Palisades project bill was under consideration last year. In my opinion, he is a very high-class gentleman, who is working for the interests of the Northwest and for the people whom he represents there.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the amendment I offer has been stated. It is the question before the Senate. Let me state in advance of my discussion that I think this is a most unusual procedure. I know of no precedent for it, and, therefore, I think I should take a little time to explain it. The amendment I offer is definitely legislation on an

appropriation bill, and is subject to a point of order, if any Member of the Senate desires to make the point. I have given notice which would permit me to move to suspend the rules for the purpose of adopting the amendment. I now give notice that I shall not take advantage of such a motion. The amendment which I offer is germane to this bill, as a matter of fact, though I doubt whether, as a legal proposition, that is true.

My reason for offering the amendment is this: This bill includes an appropriation to the Interior Department, particularly to the Bureau of Land Management, for the administration of approximately 2,250,000 or 2,500,000 acres of timbered land in western Oregon, known as the Oregon and California revested lands. That appropriation is limited by law to an amount not in excess of 25 percent of the proceeds realized from the use and management of the lands, almost entirely from the sale of timber from the land.

There is also an amendment in the bill, which was denied in the House, for an appropriation in addition to the administrative appropriation, for construction of access roads. The amendment is discussed on page 11 of the report, and is found in the bill on page 8. It provides for an appropriation of \$995,000, which is \$1,000,000 less the personnel cut, for construction of access roads, acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads adjacent to the lands on the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands.

There are two sets of these revested lands. One was revested by act of Congress, the other was reconveyed by agreement between the then owners of the land and the Government. One was a railroad grant, originally; the other, a highway grant. The reconveyed highway grant is of little consequence, and I shall not take up the time of the Senate to discuss it; but, Mr. President, because of the fact that the House had denied the budget request for the construction of the access roads, and because of the discussion that followed in the subcommittee, and later, in the full committee, I made an explanation of the situation, referred to the record, and there was thereafter prepared an explanation which is found on page 11 of the report.

In that connection, Mr. President, I called attention, first, to the long history of the legislation with respect to these lands, to the fact that there has been an established policy with reference to disposition of receipts, going back to 1916, when the title to the land was revested in the Government. I also invited attention to amendments to the basic legislation continuing through the years, including a final basic amendment in the year 1937.

I called attention to the fact that in the last amendment there was inserted a provision for division of the proceeds arising from the management of the land which basically gave to the Government one-half and to the counties

in which the lands are situated, one-half, and that the provision for payment to the Government was for 25 percent to be available for administrative purposes, the remaining 25 percent to be applied to repay a debit account in the Treasury which, in 1937, represented approximately \$8,000,000, and which was charged against the lands in question.

By the act of 1937 that 25 percent was to be applied to extinguishing the debt until it was completely extinguished, at which time it would be available to be paid to the counties in question.

I called attention to the fact that I was the attorney of record for those same counties at the time the act was passed and actively participated in the hearings on the legislation and in the rewriting of the act, and was probably solely responsible for the particular provision with reference to the 25 percent of receipts.

I called attention to the fact that the basic legislation with reference to these lands was predicated upon the concept that the local governments, States and counties, should receive one-half of the income, and the Government should receive the other half. That policy had remained in effect, but one of the changes made through the years was the right of the counties, if their one-half of the receipts did not equal what they would have received in taxes had the lands remained on the tax rolls where they originally were, the Government would advance the difference, thus creating no debit on the Treasury's books.

I called attention to the fact that there had been sad experience on the part of the counties for 20 years with reference to such taxes and that the 25 percent residual claim of the counties was included as a part of the act of 1937 to give assurance to the counties that the entire proceeds from the sale of the lands would be available for taxes if they were necessary for that purpose.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. CORDON. May I have some additional time?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield five additional minutes to the Senator; but, first, let me see if I correctly understand the statement of the Senator. This arrangement is to be consummated within a year, and, therefore, we can adopt this amendment, and there is the assurance that the counties will from now on obtain all that is due them, but, at the same time, by the adoption of the amendment, approximately a million dollars more will go into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. CORDON. That is substantially correct. The 5 minutes now granted me will be ample time in which more fully to explain the situation.

The assurance in the act, which was proper at the time it was placed there, is no longer needed. Experience has indicated that the lands are self-sustaining and that there is no need for any assurance beyond the 50-percent provision so far as their tax equities are involved. The original understanding was that the

25 percent contingent payment was to be assurance only. It is no longer needed. The deficit in the Treasury, which was \$8,000,000 in 1937, is now extinguished. As soon as the account can be settled there will be no further debit balance. Either the 25 percent should now go to the counties—and I dare say the counties would be most happy to have it—or it should revert to the Treasury.

In accordance with the original understanding in this case, and with the full consent of the officials of the counties involved, I have prepared proposed legislation which has been awaiting certain changes with reference to an administrative provision. The Senate has added the million-dollar item for access roads which are needed to develop the land. In view of the fact that the debit has been extinguished, that the guaranty is no longer needed, I think it is altogether proper that I offer an amendment to the bill which will reinstate the original concept and basic policy of the act and will result, beginning with the present fiscal year, in a credit to the Treasury of the United States on account of those lands, in addition to a portion of the 25 percent which has not been used for administrative purposes, of not \$1,000,000 a year, but from \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000 a year.

I offer the amendment as an appropriation in reverse English. I want to make an appropriation to the funds of the Treasury and not an appropriation from those funds.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I simply want to say that I think my colleague has made an unanswerable argument in support of his amendment, and I wish to associate myself in support of it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am directed by the committee to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, line 19, after the word "facilities", it is proposed to insert: "and including a payment to the Grand Coulee School District, Washington, for school facilities, proportionate to the payment made to the Coulee Dam district, Washington, in fiscal 1951, based on relative enrollment of dependents of Bureau of Reclamation and contractor employees."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the body of the Record at this point a letter which I wrote to the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. HAYDEN], which explains my amendment.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND
FOREIGN COMMERCE,
June 28, 1951.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Interior
Appropriations, United States Sen-
ate.

DEAR SENATOR: I know you will remember the case of the Grand Coulee school district at Grand Coulee, Wash. During the past three sessions you have been very sympathetic toward the problem and very patient with me in my repeated efforts to obtain treatment for this district from the Bureau of Reclamation proportionate to that accorded Coulee Dam school district.

In the Eighty-first Congress, first session, your committee included language in its report (S. Rept. 661, 81st Cong., 1st sess., p. 48), as well as in the second session (S. Rept. 1941, p. 146), instructing the Bureau to make payments to Grand Coulee school district for school facilities proportionate to the payments the Bureau was authorized to make to Coulee Dam district.

Pursuant to those instructions the Bureau paid some \$300,000 to Grand Coulee district in fiscal 1950. A serious complication, however, has arisen in connection with the proposed and final payment for fiscal 1951. This is how the complication arose.

Subsequent to passage of the Interior appropriation bill for fiscal 1951, Public Law 815—the so-called School Construction Act of 1950—was enacted. The question arose as to whether the language of the Senate report prevailed or whether Public Law 815 prevails.

To resolve the issue Bureau of Reclamation and Grand Coulee district prepared a tentative cooperative agreement and submitted the question to the Comptroller General. I am attaching a copy of the letter I sent to Comptroller, stating my views on the subject. The Secretary of the Interior, in his letter of transmittal to the Comptroller General, expressed willingness of the Department to proceed with the payment on the proviso that a favorable ruling on the legality of such action was received from the Comptroller General.

In addition to the views expressed by me and the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Education wrote a strong letter, pointing out that the only means by which the Grand Coulee district can receive its entitlement to Federal aid is through the Bureau of Reclamation. This arises from the fact that the base date established in Public Law 815 is the school year 1938-39. Payments to districts qualifying under Public Law 815 are made on the basis of any increased enrollment subsequent to 1938-39, arising from Federal activity.

Unfortunately, 1938-39 was the peak year of construction at Grand Coulee Dam. During subsequent years the work tapered off to the relatively stable level which now prevails. Since there are fewer dependents of Bureau employees in Grand Coulee schools now than there were in 1938-39, the district is entitled to no assistance under Public Law 815.

You will remember I was one of those most active in sponsoring and pressing for enactment of the school-construction law. It completely escaped my notice, as it did that of Congressman BARDEN and others, that the 1938-39 base date would exclude Grand Coulee. Furthermore, we proceeded under the assumption that we had this matter nailed down by the language in the Senate report.

The Comptroller General has rendered a decision adverse to this school district, asserting that, in his opinion, the terms of the School Construction Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 967) preclude completing the transaction as proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant to the Senate report language.

I am convinced your committee and the Congress intended the school system of Grand Coulee to receive from the Bureau of Reclamation the same kind of assistance accorded the school system serving the town of Grand Coulee Dam. Both accommodate students who are dependents of Bureau employees or contractors. Neither would be confronted with the current construction problem to the extent they are, were it not for this fact.

To rectify the injustice that will be done to the Grand Coulee district unless the complications I just recited are clarified, I am proposing the inclusion of language in this year's appropriation bill. Something along the following lines would be adequate:

Under the subtitle "Construction and rehabilitation," after the word "facilities," insert the following: "and including payment to the Grand Coulee, Wash., for school facilities, proportionate to the payment made to the Coulee Dam district, Washington, in fiscal 1951, based on relative enrollment of dependents of Bureau of Reclamation employees and contractor employees."

I have sought the advice of the Chief Counsel of the General Accounting Office, and the suggestion I have just made appears the best method of correcting what will otherwise be a serious inequity, without writing into Public Law 815 an exception which may prove both troublesome and costly.

I sincerely hope you will agree with my conviction that this district is entitled to Federal assistance and that the method I am proposing is the best and most expeditious way of giving it.

For myself and the Grand Coulee school district I want to express to you our sincere appreciation for the patient consideration you and the committee have accorded this problem.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I might say, briefly, to the distinguished Senator from Arizona that the purpose of the amendment is to allow the Bureau of Reclamation to make school payments to the town of Grand Coulee as well as to the town of Coulee Dam. The towns are on opposite sides of the dam. The Comptroller General, since the payments were started, in referring to Public Law 183 which provides for grants-in-aid to school districts, did not know whether it superseded the Appropriation Committee's allowance in all these cases, so the Interior Department did not know whether it could make a payment or not, if the language does not allow them to do for Grand Coulee what they do for Coulee Dam. All the amendment does is to allow the same thing to be done for Grand Coulee that is done for Coulee Dam.

Mr. HAYDEN. In addition to that, of course, it will continue the doing of what has been done right along in the two towns.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. On behalf of the committee I accept the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I now yield to the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], who has been waiting very patiently for some time to be recognized.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I shall take but a moment or two. The Senate has agreed to the committee amendment on page 33 of the bill, line 7, appropriating the sum of \$11,370,000 for construction work under the National Park Service. I realize that of that amount \$1,150,000 is allocated for liquidation of obligations for Independence National Historic Park, Pennsylvania, and that \$3,000,000 is for the liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in section 4 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950. Yet the remainder of that amount, after those two obligations have been provided for, will be for new construction.

The President in his message to Congress suggested that during these times we should not spend any money for new construction. In my humble opinion the President's suggestion covers the item on page 33 as well as some of the other items contained in the bill. Particularly at this time when the materials necessary to be used for the purposes provided in the bill may be so essential to the war effort, we should not be appropriating up to \$7,000,000 to the National Park Service for new construction.

I have talked with the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and he has informed me that in certain areas it is necessary, in order to maintain a past policy in the National Park Service, that such appropriation be made. I agree with what he has said, but I think we could very well have a moratorium on expenditure for new construction contained in this portion of the bill.

I want to thank the Senator from Arizona for giving me the opportunity of making this statement at this time on the item involved on page 33.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me so I may ask him a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I notice under the section on Bureau of Indian Affairs, on page 15, beginning in line 24, under the subhead "Tribal funds," there appear the words, "there is hereby appropriated \$2,109,000 from tribal funds" for various benefits and expenses. One of the purposes is set forth on page 16, in lines 9 and 10, in these words: "compensation and expenses of attorneys and other persons employed by Indian tribes under approved contracts."

I wish to state to the distinguished Senator from Arizona that the Yakima Tribal Council of the Yakima Tribe of Indians unanimously approved a resolution on August 11, 1950, authorizing the sum of \$5,000 for attorneys' fees and expenses necessary for the preparation of tribal claims. My question, sir, is whether or not that claim can be accommodated from the proviso, which begins on page 16, line 22, and which reads:

That in addition to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds may be ad-

vanced to Indian tribes during the current fiscal year for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of the particular tribe involved and approved by the Secretary?

Mr. HAYDEN. I may say to the Senator from Washington that I think that proviso fully covers the case he has mentioned.

Mr. CAIN. I appreciate the information received from the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I send to the desk an amendment designated "7-9-51-F" which I offer and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. No funds or contract authorizations made available by this act shall be used for the construction of any structure, work, or other project unless (1) such construction is certified by the Secretary of Defense to be essential to national security, or (2) the construction of such structure work, or other project has been commenced prior to the enactment of this act, and substantial detriment to the interests of the United States will result if the proposed further construction is not carried out.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the amendment is clearly subject to a point of order as being legislation on an appropriation bill. I shall not make that point of order now. I reserve the objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not question but that the amendment may be subject to a point of order, but if a point of order is made I shall make a motion to suspend the rule. I have served the proper notice of such motion, which is at the desk.

Mr. President, it will not take long to discuss the amendment. It speaks for itself. It merely provides, first, that any new project that is provided for under this bill, which is not certified to be essential to the national defense, or, second, if work upon the project has not progressed to the point where stopping it would result in material loss to the Government, it shall be suspended for the duration of this emergency.

We head the administration express concern to the effect that we are threatened with inflation. I agree with that. No one disputes the fact but that there is a shortage of construction materials. If that is true, there is no reason in the world why we should not suspend immediately—in fact it should have been done a year ago—the construction work upon every government public works project that is not essential to our national defense program. Every nonessential project should be postponed until this emergency is over. Every project upon which work has been started and upon which suspension could be made without resulting in a material loss to the Government should also be suspended.

The amendment is exactly the substance of the Presidential directive under which we operated during World War II. It was put in operation at that time,

and all nonessential public works were suspended. It contains the substance of the directive put out by President Truman about a year ago in July 1950 but unfortunately this last directive so far has not been put into effect. I think the only way we can put it into effect is by legislation enacted on the floor of the Senate to cut the appropriations. It is our responsibility to stand up and be counted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. To whom does the Senator from Delaware propose to give the discretion to determine whether or not any of these projects are essential to the national defense?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is proposed to give it to the Secretary of Defense. I have checked with the Departments, and it was recommended that that is the most appropriate agency to certify the projects.

Mr. MORSE. The amendment proposes to give that discretion to the Secretary of Defense?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Without any check upon the exercise of that discretion by the Congress?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The same check that the Congress can put upon the Secretary of Defense in connection with any of the other expenditures he is making.

It is the same Secretary of Defense who will administer \$60,000,000,000 worth of military appropriations next year. If the Secretary of Defense is a man in whom the Senate does not have confidence, we can replace him at any time we wish. He is the logical man in whom to repose the confidence. I do not care whether the Secretary of Defense is the man who makes the decision or whether it is the head of some other agency. That is immaterial to me. I have placed the Secretary of Defense in the amendment because it seemed to be the general consensus of opinion that he was the logical one in whom to repose the authority. If the Senator from Oregon has any suggestions, or if the chairman of the committee has any suggestions other than that, I shall be glad to consider them. The important thing is that work on every nonessential Government project should be suspended. Otherwise, let us stop calling upon the American people to stop their unnecessary buying. Mr. DiSalle, the President of the United States, and other spokesmen for the administration are daily calling upon every American citizen to do exactly what the Government itself is not doing. My amendment merely says that we are willing to practice what we preach, otherwise let us shut up.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does not the Senator agree with me that it is within the jurisdiction of Congress to exercise discretion in the first instance, when these projects are first brought before the Appropriations Committee, and that

later they are subject to consideration by the Congress? If we exercise our jurisdiction properly, it will not be necessary for us to grant such wide discretion to an administrative officer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Congress may authorize these projects, but it is not within the power of any individual Member of Congress or any committee of Congress to appraise the situation and determine whether or not project X is essential to the national defense effort. We do not have the facilities. We do not know whether or not the Government might have a plan to establish a certain war plant in a given area, where the construction of a dam is necessary. We do not have such information. It is impossible for us to get it. In times of emergency we must delegate a certain amount of authority to the administration. This amendment merely provides that the Government of the United States shall practice what it is calling upon every American citizen to do, and that is to postpone nonessential expenditures and nonessential projects until the emergency is over. I see no reason why the amendment should not be adopted, and I am hoping that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] will accept the amendment and save any further argument, because I think he himself will endorse the principle about which I am speaking.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have no quarrel with the principle, but as chairman of the subcommittee I do not feel justified in accepting the amendment when no hearings have been held on it. It is clearly legislation. If such a provision were to be adopted, it should come from a legislative committee. The Senator is asking me to take something which he has written. I knew nothing particularly about it before he brought it to the attention of the Senate.

The amendment would repose enormous power in the Secretary of Defense. It might have a very crippling effect on something the Government wanted to do. On the other hand, I have no doubt about the good intent of the Senator from Delaware. Let me suggest to him, if he does not feel satisfied that a legislative committee should have jurisdiction over this subject and pass upon it, that he at least come before the Senate Committee on Appropriations and let us have a hearing. Let a showing be made as to why this legislation is necessary. If the Senator from Delaware can convince the committee that it is necessary, we can then report a provision and make it applicable to all the appropriation bills. We have already passed two great appropriation bills, the independent-offices bill and the Labor and Federal Security bill. This is the third one. The two earlier bills would certainly be exempt from the proposed legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may say to the Senator from Arizona that this is the first public-works appropriation bill. When the Senator speaks of the Labor and Federal-security bill, he is not speaking of Government projects all over the country. As for his argument that it should have been submitted to

the committee, I point out to the Senator from Arizona that he is slightly in error. There have been hearings on this proposal, to this extent; this provision was in operation throughout World War II. The Senator from Arizona was a Member of the Senate at that time, and he is familiar with its operation. It is in operation, supposedly—at least on paper—today. The President has issued a directive. However, he is not carrying it out.

I presented this proposal last year to the Senate in connection with the appropriation bill. The same argument was made then as is made now. It was said that time was needed to study it, and that consideration would be given to inserting it in the appropriation bills this year. It is past time for study; it is time for action.

As I have stated before, I am not a member of the Appropriations Committee. As an easterner, I have never been able to crash the sacred precincts of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware is asking me to take a certain text which he has prepared, and which he tells me is identical with something which has been enacted heretofore. I have had no opportunity to find out whether or not that is a correct statement of the fact. I have had no opportunity to compare it with whatever was the law during the war, or whatever is now the President's order. I believe that we should at least have an opportunity to see whether it goes beyond anything that was agreed to heretofore. The Senator would hardly expect us, in a matter of this kind, simply to accept his word.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may say to the Senator from Arizona that I have discussed this subject with him for 2 or 3 days. He could readily have checked the background. The proposal was presented last year not only to the members of the Appropriations Committee but the full Senate. It is past time for study; it is time for action. All I am proposing is to suspend all nonessential Government public-works projects, at least for the duration of this emergency. No Member takes exception to that proposal, so let us vote for it.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator has discussed the matter with me alone. I believe that all members of the Appropriations Committee ought to know about it, and all Senators who are interested ought to have an opportunity to know about it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I repeat, the amendment was prepared by the Legislative Counsel to carry out the substance of the directive under which we operated in World War II. I am perfectly willing to have it clearly understood that the amendment may be modified, if necessary, to conform to the exact language of the Presidential directive under which we operated during World War II. If there is any variation between the language of the amendment and the language of that provision, I shall be willing to modify the amendment accordingly.

The amendment is very simple. It merely provides that construction shall

be stopped upon any project upon which work has not been started, until it is certified to be essential to the national defense. Or if work has been started, and if it has not progressed to the point where the Government would lose money by suspending it, it shall be stopped. That is very simple. It does not require a lawyer, or even a member of the Appropriations Committee, to understand that simple amendment. The President is daily telling 150,000,000 American people to do the same thing. I say, let us practice what we preach.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Delaware for his confidence in my ability to understand his proposal. However, I am required, under the directive of the committee which I happen to represent at this time as chairman of the subcommittee, to make the point of order that this is legislation upon an appropriation bill; and I do make the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will withhold his point of order for a moment, I do not intend to debate the point of order. I have filed a notice, and I intend to ask for a suspension of the rule. However, I first wish to point out to the Senator from Arizona that he himself accepted two amendments, immediately prior to my offering this amendment, and those two amendments were legislation upon an appropriation bill. No one disputed that fact. So legislation upon an appropriation bill to this extent is nothing new.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am asking the Senator from Delaware to do exactly what Senators interested in the other two amendments did. Both amendments were presented to the committee, and the committee authorized them to be offered on the floor, thereby relieving me of my responsibility. If the Senator from Delaware will come before the Appropriations Committee and do what the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] did with respect to their legislative proposals, and if the committee directs that no point of order be made, it will not be made. But in the absence of the Senator's appearance before the committee, I am compelled to make the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I repeat that I presented this same proposal to the Senator from Arizona, to every member of the Appropriations Committee, and every Member of the United States Senate, a year ago. Apparently it has not been read since. I called it to your attention again several days ago and was reminded that I was not a member of the Appropriations Committee.

I am looking forward to the day when some of us from the East can crash the sacred precincts of the Appropriations Committee and be on the inside so that we can present some of these sound proposals.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order has been made that this amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair rules that the amendment would impose an additional

burden and additional duties upon the Secretary of Defense, in determining whether or not any particular project was essential to the national security. Upon that basis it would be legislation on an appropriation bill, and therefore the Chair is compelled to sustain the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, pursuant to written notice heretofore given by me, I move that clause 4 of rule XVI be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is made by the Senator from Delaware to suspend the rule. Fifteen minutes are allowed on each side.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield, without prejudice to his right to the floor, and without being charged with any time, in order that I may make an announcement?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am glad to yield.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have been asked what the program of the Senate will be for the coming week. It is our intention to finish consideration of this bill and take a recess until next Tuesday, so as to give the Appropriations Committee an opportunity to meet all day Monday and report some more appropriation bills.

On next Tuesday we shall take up first Calendar 511, H. R. 2416, relating to exclusion from gross income of income from discharge of indebtedness. It is the bill which was referred to the Committee on Finance, with instructions that it be reported back to the Senate in 2 weeks. It deals with an amendment to the Social Security Act provision for the aged, the blind, and dependent children.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from Arizona refer to the bill in which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Taft] is very much interested?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the majority leader asked me if it would be agreeable to go ahead with the program he is now announcing, and I said it would be so far as I was concerned. I am informed by the secretary of the minority that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Taft] had talked to the majority leader, and my understanding was that the Senator from Ohio had asked that the bill go over until Wednesday. Does the majority leader intend to bring up that bill first, or let it come up second? The Senator from Ohio will not return to Washington until Wednesday of next week. I am wondering whether it could be made a part of the program, but that it be brought up on Wednesday, instead of on Tuesday.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to accommodate the Senator from Ohio. For that reason we will plan to bring up the bill on Wednesday. I do not think it will take more than a few moments to dispose of it.

First we will take up Calendar 519, Senate bill 832, to reduce the annual

leave of Federal officers and employees to 15 days during the continuance of the existing national emergency, and for other purposes. I believe it is important that we dispose of the bill, because some amendments have been attached to an appropriation bill with regard to annual leave of Federal employees.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask whether the bill to abolish the RFC, which was reported today, will be taken up in the immediate future.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know anything about the bill. If it has been reported today, I could not answer the Senator's question. The Majority Policy Committee has not had an opportunity to consider it. We will take it up at the next meeting.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McFARLAND. Next we will take up Calendar 227, Senate bill 630, to suspend until December 31, 1952, the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask whether I correctly understand the program as announced by the distinguished majority leader. On Tuesday, in the event that the Senate should recess until then, the order of business will be, first, Calendar 519, S. 832, to reduce the annual leave of Federal employees, and so forth; second, Calendar 227, Senate bill 630; third, the so-called extension of social security benefits bill, Calendar 511, H. R. 2416.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Long in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to suspend the rule.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Holland	Millikin
Bennett	Hunt	Morse
Bricker	Ives	Mundt
Bridges	Jenner	Neely
Butler, Md.	Johnson, Colo.	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Johnson, Tex.	O'Connor
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Kefauver	Robertson
Carlson	Kem	Sattonstall
Chavez	Kerr	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Lehman	Stennis
Eastland	Lodge	Thye
Ecton	Long	Underwood
Ferguson	Magnuson	Watkins
Frear	Malone	Welker
George	Maybank	Wherry
Hayden	McCarthy	Williams
Hendrickson	McClellan	Young
Hennings	McFarland	
Hill	McKellar	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to suspend rule XVI, clause 4, of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient second? The request seems to be sufficiently seconded.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, what is the decision of the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is endeavoring to ascertain whether there is a sufficient second to the request for the yeas and nays.

Is there a sufficient second to the request for the yeas and nays?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware to suspend rule XVI, clause 4, of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, how many Senators must second the request for the yeas and nays, in order to have the yeas and nays ordered? It seemed to me that half of the Senators present held up their hands, indicating that they were seconding the request for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk counted 9, and a minimum of 10 are required.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask for a recount.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order has been called for.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask for a recount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware to suspend rule XVI, clause 4.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Nebraska permit the Chair to listen to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the request for the yeas and nays was not sufficiently seconded, can the request be made again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised it would be out of order to call for the yeas and nays again, no business having been transacted since the previous request.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that there be inserted in the RECORD a copy of certain resolutions which have been received recently by the junior Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

[The resolutions appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, now that the Senate has transacted business, I ask again for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I inquire what is the pending question? Will the Chair state the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Delaware to suspend the rules in order that he may submit an amendment to the bill which is presently before the Senate. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll. Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference in Geneva, Switzerland.

On this vote the Senator from Montana is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent because of illness.

I announce further that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] has a general pair on this vote with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations has a general pair on this vote with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea" and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGE] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—12

Bricker
Bridges
Butler, Md.
Dirksen

Ferguson
Hendrickson
Ives
Kem

Lodge
Robertson
Schoeppel
Williams

NAYS—52

Anderson
Bennett
Butler, Nebr.
Cain
Capehart
Carlson
Chavez
Cordon
Dworshak
Eastland
Eaton
Frear
George
Hayden
Hennings
Hill
Holland
Hunt

Jenner
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Tex.
Johnston, S. C.
Kefauver
Kerr
Kilgore
Knowland
Lehman
Long
Magnuson
Malone
Maybank
McCarthy
McClellan
McFarland
McKellar
Millikin

Morse
Mundt
Neely
Nixon
O'Connor
O'Mahoney
Saltonstall
Smith, Maine
Smith, N. C.
Stennis
Thye
Underwood
Watkins
Welker
Wherry
Young

NOT VOTING—32

Aiken
Benton
Brewster
Byrd
Case
Clements
Connally
Douglas
Duff
Ellender
Flanders

Fulbright
Gillette
Green
Hickenlooper
Hoey
Humphrey
Langer
Martin
McCarran
McMahon
Monroney

Moody
Murray
Pastore
Russell
Smathers
Smith, N. J.
Sparkman
Taft
Tobey
Wiley

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, two-thirds of the Members voting having failed to vote in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add to section 305 a new paragraph, as follows:

During the last quarter of the fiscal year 1952, no greater amount may be obligated for several budget objects of expenditure, namely, 0-3, supplies and materials; 0-9, equipment; and 0-10, lands and structures, under each appropriation or authorization herein, than the average quarterly amount so obligated during the first three-quarters of such fiscal year, unless the Director of the Budget shall find in any particular case that the public interest requires the obligation of a greater amount.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I understand that the purpose of the amendment is to get away from the hoarding of funds during the first three-quarters of the year and

spending them during the last quarter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is not legislation; it is entirely proper, and I accept the amendment on behalf of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I might say to the membership that the practice aimed at by the amendment just voted on has grown up in Government, in a desire on the part of agencies to be rather frugal and hoard money in the first three-quarters of the year, and sometimes in the last quarter money is squandered for pictures, carpets, paintings, and so forth, and it has become something of an abuse.

There are agencies of government which are very careful in husbanding their funds, and they do turn money back into the Treasury. On the other hand, certain heads of agencies have discovered that when they turn money back sometimes an additional appropriation is required for the next fiscal year.

I want to say to the members of the committee that if my amendment needs some modification in conference to make it administratively feasible, certainly I should have no objection to such modification.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Illinois will find that in appropriation bills unexpended balances are made available for future years. I agree heartily with the purpose of the Senator's amendment, but I think there are occasions when, in various areas, as in Alaska, for example, it might be necessary to make rather large expenditures in the last quarter rather than in the second or third quarter. I also think that construction items, such as are dealt with in the Bureau of Reclamation, have seasonal aspects which must be considered. I take it that the language of the Senator's amendment vests in the Director of the Bureau of the Budget the power to say whether the obligation of a larger amount is in the public interest, and it would embrace all such factors.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I desire to associate myself with the sponsor of the amendment, and with the observations which have been made with reference to it. I conferred with the Senator from Illinois before the amendment was offered, and I am in complete accord with the purpose of it. I appreciate the statement which was made by the Senator from Illinois that if modification should be required to make the amendment more feasible administratively, the Senator would have no objection. The purpose the Senator has in mind is something which has been called to my attention many times as a member of the Appropriations Committee. When an agency conserves money,

and seeks to protect its appropriation, the first question we ask at the next appropriation hearing is, "Do you have an unexpended balance? If so, why did you ask for so much money in the first place?"

The amendment will encourage agencies to anticipate. The principle is sound, and it will help all agencies to conserve, and to see to it that the appropriations they request are not more than are adequate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe Senators on the Appropriations Committee have recognized the evil of agencies spending a great part of their appropriations in the last quarter of the year. When we passed the last continuing resolution we wrote in it a provision that they should spend on the basis of the first quarter rather than on the basis of the last quarter. I think the Senator from Illinois has hit on an idea which might save the Government some money, because the Senator from Michigan, as well as other Senators, has learned that certain departments are quite busy in the last months of the year in seeing to it that they spend all their remaining funds. This amendment will strike at that very practice. I hope language will be worked out in the conference so that seasonal projects will not be adversely affected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In an extraordinary situation the Budget Director can modify the rate of expenditure.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wonder whether the Senator expects to offer a similar amendment in connection with the military appropriation bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not reached that bridge yet.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is a bridge which we must reach. This is another way of cutting off essential appropriations. If Congress thinks it has provided too much money, it should reduce the amount, instead of operating through an amendment of this nature. I am happy that I voted against it, because by the time we get through with it the administrative responsibility will become apparent.

Let us consider, for instance, soil conservation payments. The appropriations are so late this year that the agency will not make payments during the first, second, or third quarter. They will be made in the fourth quarter. The arrangement provided is as absurd as it can be.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Perhaps my friend did not notice the escape clause.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, I noticed it. Everything is to be referred to the Bureau of the Budget. I think that is a very serious thing. I do not know why the Senator would trust the Bureau of the Budget more than he would trust Members of Congress. I have many times objected to the fact that Congress does not seem to be able to pass legislation unless the Bureau of the Budget approves it. It seems to me Congress has a right to pass legislation. I have

many times supported legislation which did not bear the stamp of approval of the Bureau of the Budget, because sometimes they do not have the cumulative wisdom of all the Members of the House and Senate. I do not know why we should say in those circumstances that we have to take the judgment of one person in the Bureau of the Budget against the combined judgment of the Senate and the House. That is why I thought it was a bad amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, appropriations originate in the Bureau of the Budget in the first instance. They are the first to hear testimony concerning proposed appropriations. They confer with the President. They finally determine what figures shall come to the Congress. For all practical purposes, that is the administrative body in the executive branch which deals with this matter.

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, yes, but the Bureau of the Budget having taken their position, the Congress can override them; the Congress can raise or lower the amounts as it sees fit. Having done so, why should the Congress redelegate the matter to the Bureau of the Budget to decide? Why should the Bureau of the Budget again place its hands on the matter?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Because the Bureau of the Budget anticipates an even flow in the expenditure of the money, as it is contemplated in the appropriation, and when abuses result they should take steps to remedy them.

Mr. ANDERSON. In this contemplated even flow of money through the year the Bureau is taking into consideration the past experience of the United States for 100 years. Everyone who has watched appropriations knows that the money does not flow evenly. The Congress will not complete action on the appropriation bills until late this year. The way we are proceeding with the bill now under consideration, we will not be through with the appropriation bills until September. An agency cannot begin to plan its expenditures until it knows what the appropriations are going to be. I believe the Senator is completely wrong in his view of the matter.

I wanted my statement to appear in the Record at this point because with the adoption of the amendment we will find difficulties arising in connection with it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator from New Mexico deny there are abuses, as have just been pointed out?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not at all. I agree with what the Senator from Illinois has said about there being abuses. I realize that agencies rush in to try to buy furniture in the last few days of the fiscal year. But I think such considerations are trifling compared with the handicap which will be placed on the whole program of the Government by the adoption of the Senator's amendment, which would make the Bureau of the Budget decide whether, for example, the purchase of 10 chairs is reasonable.

I merely express the hope that the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House—and I had the distinct pleasure of serving with my friend the Senator from Illinois on the Appro-

priations Committee of the House—will continue their careful consideration of the various programs, and will cut down or expand as they see fit. I myself am quite willing to trust the matter of public appropriations to the Senate and House, committees of which consider these questions carefully, and after having considered them the Senate and the House can proceed to act effectively. When the Senate and House have done so I shall be satisfied. I do not want to refer such questions back to the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to continue for a short period, if my friend the Senator from Arizona will allot me five additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls attention to the fact that the amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator if he will yield me five additional minutes, so I may make a further statement.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield the time requested to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we are approaching the end of the consideration of the bill. It has been on the floor and debated for quite a long period of time. I must confess I am not happy about the result.

First of all, I wish to call attention to the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who, it has been reported in the press, has indicated that we have got to find some way of making deep cuts in the budget, probably as much as \$7,000,000,000 a year, if we are going to avert a very onerous and burdensome increase in taxes.

Mr. President, I went to the trouble to examine what the total result of our 8 or 9 days of deliberation on the bill has been. There were two amendments adopted on the floor which increased the appropriations by respectively \$70,000 and \$144,750. There were four amendments that decreased the appropriations. One amendment decreased the amount by \$1,683,000. One amendment decreased the amount by \$191,000. Another by \$189,000, and the last amendment by \$728,600. So the net saving, after all these deliberations, is \$2,576,954 on a bill which carries direct appropriations of \$520,000,000.

Items not chargeable against the revenue are \$79,000,000, and then permanent and indefinite appropriations are \$60,000,000.

So there are chargeable approximately \$580,000,000, in round figures, against the revenue. If we expect to find the \$7,000,000,000 spoken of by our esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], I think we are going to have to do infinitely better than we have done up to this good hour.

Knowing of course, the sanctity with which we regard military appropriations, I begin to despair that we are ever going to find the goal to offset and compensate against a possible and burdensome tax increase.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to call to the attention of the Senator from Illinois, that on page 47 of the House committee hearings there was presented a table showing the estimated and actual miscellaneous receipts and trust funds deposited in the Treasury of the United States for the fiscal years 1950, 1951, and 1952 as a result of the operations of the Department of the Interior. The net receipts of all general and special funds in 1950 amounted to \$129,717,458. The estimated net receipts for 1952 amount to \$176,099,438. I read the net receipts so as to avoid all duplications. But I want to point out in connection with the reduction of appropriations—an objective with which I completely agree—that there is a difference between the expenditure of Government funds for productive enterprise and expenditures which are nonproductive.

The Department of the Interior is emphatically a department which han-

dles the investment of productive funds. The expenditures which are authorized in this bill for the Bureau of Reclamation, the National Park Service, and many other activities, produce more business and more revenue. Take, for example, the national parks, which some may consider normally as being merely for recreational purposes. In 1950 the number of individuals who visited all the national parks of the United States aggregated more than 32,000,000. The entire appropriation in 1950 for the National Park Service was a little more than \$30,000,000, or less than \$1 a head.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table appearing on page 47 of the House committee hearings, to which I have referred, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Estimated and actual miscellaneous receipts and trust funds deposited in the Treasury of the United States for fiscal years 1950, 1951, and 1952

Source of funds	1950 actual	1951 estimate	1952 estimate
1. Admission fees and concessions.....	\$3,179,396	\$3,373,069	\$3,369,283
2. Hunting stamps, fees, and licenses.....	4,417,879	4,265,679	4,232,480
3. Grazing fees.....	1,248,242	2,075,068	2,205,500
4. Revenues, Oregon and California and Coos Bay Wagon Road lands.....	4,018,578	8,351,194	13,055,000
5. Sale of sealskins and other products.....	511,146	4,300,427	4,935,315
6. Oil, gas, and mining royalties and rents.....	18,316,600	10,284,800	18,294,800
7. Interest on and repayments to Colorado River Dam fund and other funds.....	7,070,921	6,307,502	6,302,495
8. Revenues from Colorado River Dam fund project.....	8,778,773	9,021,575	10,521,575
9. Collections, reclamation funds.....	41,105,428	54,206,000	61,931,000
10. Collections, Colorado River development fund.....	500,947	100	100
11. Sale of helium and of gas from helium plants.....	447,518	460,000	460,000
12. Sale of Bonneville power.....	29,330,968	31,337,000	32,586,000
13. Sale of Southeastern power.....	1,980,552	3,521,592	4,030,000
14. Sale of Southwestern power.....	1,955,870	1,310,000	2,457,000
15. Sale of Fort Peck power.....	1,800,615	2,162,830	2,394,930
16. Miscellaneous rentals, fees, and permits.....	2,007,098	2,171,945	2,161,750
17. Collections for services to Indians.....	14,180,409	14,500,500	15,000,500
18. Alaska Railroad receipts.....	1,514,102	1,277,742	1,113,710
19. Unclassified receipts.....			
Gross receipts, general and special funds.....	141,364,942	167,337,023	186,781,438
Less duplications ¹	11,647,484	10,979,000	10,682,000
Net receipts, general and special funds.....	129,717,458	156,358,023	176,099,438
All trust funds.....	30,155,741	60,629,095	18,194,035
Gross receipts, all funds.....	171,520,683	227,986,118	204,975,473
Net receipts, all funds.....	159,873,199	216,987,118	194,293,473

¹ Receipts duplicated are as follows:

Source of funds	1950 actual	1951 estimate	1952 estimate
Interest on and repayments to Colorado River fund, Boulder Dam project, transferred from receipts under "Revenues from Colorado River Dam fund projects".....	\$4,823,410	\$4,500,000	\$4,500,000
Receipts from sale of power generated at the Grand Coulee Dam included in "Collections, reclamation funds" and "Sale of Bonneville power".....	8,824,074	6,479,000	6,182,000
Total.....	11,647,484	10,979,000	10,682,000

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for one additional minute to make an explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield one additional minute to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield one additional minute to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am not insensible to these receipts referred to by the Senator from Wyoming. I mentioned a little while ago that we are confronted with three items: Direct appropriations, the trust funds, and then, of course, the permanents and the indefinites. I have heard glowing stories

about the productive facilities which generate revenue, but somehow year after year we go deeper in the hole. It is like the case of a doctor who makes a very fine diagnosis, and who prescribes the most modern drugs to be administered to the patient, but the patient dies. I am going to do my little bit, feeble as it may be, and apologetic as I may be, with respect to the kind of amendment I offered a moment ago in the hope that we can yet stave off insolvency.

So I raise my feeble voice as best I know how, and I simply protest that we are not making any progress in the direction of what I think is substantial economy, unless we are going to put additional revenue burdens upon the people. Of course, there will come a day when the people are going to rebel. Then, of

course, as of necessity, we will have to have a grand rollback of appropriations in order to place the Government on a sound fiscal basis.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. There have been submitted up to this time, as I pointed out a few days ago, budget estimates, now pending before the Congress, of \$84,-382,557,427. If we passed no Interior Department appropriation bill at all, and appropriated as though there were no Department of the Interior, eliminating the entire amount of this bill, which is about \$564,000,000, on the basis of the budget estimates, and more than \$533,-000,000 as reported to the Senate, it would amount to less than two-thirds of 1 percent of the budget estimates which we have to consider. If the Senator from Illinois can tell me how we are going to meet a \$7,000,000,000 deficit by the slight reductions which we have made, or even by eliminating the entire bill, I should like to have him explain.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield an additional minute to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to have my good friend from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] listen. I remember the days when I was at the other end of the Capitol and he was in the executive branch. He used to come up to the Capitol and courteously scold me. I remember that on one occasion he said, "You have always embraced the meat-ax idea, and I simply do not agree with you." I do not know whether he remembers it or not. I have come to the conclusion, after wrestling with governmental appropriations for more than 16 years, that there is no other way to do the job except to take an ax and use it heroically. We can talk all we please about selective appropriations and about pin-pointing economy, but when we are dealing with billions of dollars and we have to roll back the budget, and that requires a little more fortitude than I have seen exemplified in the Eighty-second Congress. I make no reflection on this great body. I simply express my own frustration and disillusionment with the achievements so far.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the point I wish to make is that if we eliminated all the appropriations for the departments, if we eliminated all the appropriations for ordinary operating functions of the Government, the saving would not amount to more than \$9,000,000,000. If we eliminated \$9,000,-000,000, and if we had no Department of Justice and no Department of Agriculture, we still could not balance the budget.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not at all sure about that. I am sure that I do not agree with my esteemed and genial friend from Arizona.

Mr. WHERRY, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. What is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida requests unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder if some Senator has an amendment to offer, on which the Senator from Florida could speak.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida is speaking on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, have we reached the stage of final passage of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not yet.

Mr. WHERRY. It is all right with me.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, my sole purpose in rising is that I dislike to see a splendid gentleman, my good friend the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], suffering from frustration and disappointment over a matter of this kind. I wish to bring to him a message which I think will enable him to escape from some of that frustration.

This morning, as a member of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee having to do with the civil functions bill, it was a part of my duty to listen to the distinguished Senators from Kansas and to the entire House delegation from Kansas, as well as to numerous citizens of that fine State who are now being overwhelmed with a terrific flood disaster which they stated to us was costing the people of their State \$100,000,000 and perhaps would result in a loss of much greater proportions. They reported that already 20 precious lives had been lost.

I may state that, in the first instance, some of the men who appeared there, both Members of the Senate and Members of the House, made it very clear that they were making exceptions, in the field of conservation of national resources and of protection against floods, from their customary rule with reference to voting for all economy measures.

In the second instance, I think my good friend from Illinois should know that the one river which might have contributed disastrously to an even greater catastrophe, the Republican River, is prevented from so doing by reason of the fact that three reclamation or flood-control projects which have been completed up that river are impounding huge amounts of water, and have given a measure of security and protection against a disaster which is already the worst ever visited upon that State, and

which would be infinitely greater, but for the completion of those three projects.

I speak as one who voted for each of the economies which have been effected in this bill and for some which we did not accomplish and as one who voted—though regretfully, because I always regret to oppose the senior Senator from Arizona—against his amendment to increase these appropriations by some \$16,000,000 to begin new projects.

I do not believe that we need to apologize for voting for this bill, when it involves the protection of lives and property in the way it does in various parts of the Nation.

I hope that this message may relieve my good friend of some of his frustration, and make him feel that, after all, there are good values in this bill, as shown by the recent bitter experience of our friends in Kansas, some of whom, as I say, made it clear in their appearance this very morning that they were breaking their rule of economy in other fields in order to appear and ask that authorized flood-control projects in their State be speeded.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. The Chair can recognize Senators only by unanimous consent.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, who has control of the time on the passage of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President—

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the able Senator from Florida said something about the Republican River. I wish to say that that is the kind of service which the Republican Party always gives. [Laughter.]

The able Senator from Arizona has just pointed out that the appropriations asked for to date are about \$84,000,000,000; that approximately \$10,000,000,000 is for the normal running expenses of the Government, which leaves \$74,000,000,000 for national defense, foreign aid, interest on the debt, and I presume some other things. We ought to take a few billion dollars out of that \$74,000,000,000. I think we can take it out, without in any way injuring the United States or the world; and I think we ought to do it.

I voted for some of the cuts in this bill. Some I have not voted for. I dis-

like very much, as I am certain other Senators do, to vote to deny our own American people certain things they need, while at the same time, almost in the same breath, but at least in the same afternoon, we vote billions of dollars for other nations.

I remember sitting in this Chamber one afternoon when certain Senators, including a particular Senator who today has a reputation for being economy-minded, voted against taking one and a half billion dollars out of the six and a half billion dollar give-away program. Later he offered an amendment to take \$150,000,000 out of the rivers and harbors and flood control bill, taking it away from our own people. I am not going to vote to take too much away from our own people so long as we are voting billions of dollars for other people. I want to help other people, and will help other people. I will vote for funds to help other people. But there is a limit to the amount of money the American people have. There is a limit to the amount of money we can spend. There is a limit to the amount of money we can take away from the American people in taxation. Just what that limit is, none of us knows. But we do know that we are taking almost an unconscionable amount away in taxes, even at the present time. We do know that we are getting ready to spend sums which we have never spent before.

I am hopeful that from now on, as we come to the big appropriation bills which constitute \$74,000,000,000 of appropriations, we can take a few billion dollars out of them.

I am perfectly willing to follow the advice of the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] when he says that \$7,000,000,000 can be taken out of the \$74,000,000,000. I take his word for it. I shall follow his advice by voting to take away \$7,000,000,000. I will vote to take more than that away, because I honestly believe that it can be taken away.

I should not hesitate to spend \$84,000,000,000 this year, and I should not hesitate to increase the taxes on the American people if I thought that a year or 2 years from now the so-called emergency would end and we could reduce both appropriations and taxes.

I do not believe the American people would mind, if they had confidence that at the end of a specific period, whether it be 6 months, 1 year, or 2 years, they would be relieved of the high taxes and the enormous expenditures. But I do not believe there is much chance of giving them any guaranty of any such relief.

It seems to me that the emergency in which we find ourselves will continue for a few years. If that be so, Mr. President, we had better cut our cloth to fit our ability to pay. If we could guarantee to the American people that if we increased their taxes another \$10,000,000,000 and if we spend \$84,000,000,000 or more, in 1 or 2 years the situation will return to normal, with reasonable expenditures and reasonable taxes, I will go along, but I do not believe that will be the situation.

Therefore, I think we ought to have the courage to set an amount that we can spend with safety, both from the standpoint of protecting and defending ourselves, and likewise from the standpoint of safety in maintaining our American system of government, without bankrupting our people and bringing upon them great hardships. We ought to do it. I believe we could well reduce the \$74,000,000,000 extraordinary end of our budget. I hope we shall do it. I believe the American people are looking to us to do it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes, 3 minutes, 4 minutes, or 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], to give him an opportunity to show that he is not frustrated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have always found that some humor is always good in a legislative body. When I said I was frustrated, I said it in the most felicitous manner I could. I was thinking of the increasing burden upon the country and the constant movement of appropriations and taxes to an ever-rising plateau. I suppose hope springs eternal that some time normalcy will return and we shall be able to retrench. I remember what a distinguished Member of this body said long ago. Former Senator Smoot, of Utah, said that Government never recedes from the high level of expenditures. It is absolutely necessary that we be careful and watch the high level, if the whole history of governmental pattern is that we never go back to an earlier and lower level. The rate of acceleration and the rate of progress in the field of appropriations and taxes have been just too much for my blood, and I think for the blood of most people.

I wish to say to my esteemed friend from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] that I hope he will hold up his hand when I suggest that we have a record vote on the pending bill. His esteemed colleague not long ago submitted a resolution to modify the rules of the Senate, to require a mandatory record vote on every appropriation bill.

It is easy to gloss over these things. I came up the hard way, a long time ago, when a dollar was worth 100 cents, and when \$500,000,000 was not hay. So, I think we owe it to the country to go on record when the bill comes up for final passage. I shall hold up my hand and ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Illinois has had extensive experience as a member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives. He is fully aware of the realistic difficulties which are encountered in making selective cuts. Does not the Senator believe, as we face an ever-increasing budget for the military services, as well as for all the activities of the executive departments, that it might be feasible, instead of quibbling over small cuts in various appropriation bills, for the Senate to make an across-the-

board cut of 5 percent, 10 percent, or 15 percent, or whatever the percentage should be, and treat equally and without favoritism all appropriation bills considered by Congress? Would that not be a more efficient and effective way of approaching the entire subject of economy?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will say to my good friend from Idaho that I shall go along with any reasonable proposal. However, I am not unmindful that if we make an across-the-board cut in appropriations and then delegate to the executive departments the power to make the selective cuts, we are in a sense delegating some of the appropriating power and legislative authority of Congress. I believe it to be our responsibility to exercise such authority. The Constitution says that the Congress of the United States has the exclusive power over the public purse. I do not wish to turn my responsibility over to the President. I do not want him to take the blame for something I have refused to do. I believe I can put my finger on the point when I say that the human equation always comes into play. The question is, How do you take the "me" out of economy?

I believe the time has come for an exercise of courage on the part of everyone who has any responsibility in the matter. Otherwise how can the job be done? If the Senator's proposal is that we exercise the power and that it be not turned over to the executive departments, I shall go along with any such proposal that will do the job.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I merely wished to point out that if we were to make a 10 percent cut, on a \$500,000,000 appropriation for the Interior Department, it would mean a saving of \$50,000,000. I do not propose to grant discretionary authority to make selective cuts within an agency. The cuts would have to be made across the board on all items, so that instead of having a \$500,000,000 budget, the Department would have a \$450,000,000 budget.

Would it not be a feasible approach to the entire problem to grant no discretionary authority, but to make blanket reductions in each Department?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nine minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield another 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. First I wish to say that a rule concerning the legislative budget was provided in the Legislative Reorganization Act sometime ago, that first of all we should estimate the amount of money we would spend. Then it would be mandatory that we remain within that amount. Once a ceiling had been fixed on an appropriation bill, it could not be modified on the floor unless the ceiling were preserved. Some

modifications were made in trying to work it out. But it is the kind of thing that cannot be worked out very well. I had hoped that somehow or other we would take the proposal and make it practical and feasible. Somehow it fell by the wayside, and here we are in a stratospheric larger debt and probably a larger deficit, despite their impact upon the inflationary fever which is abroad in the land. What we do or fail to do registers in the market places and halls of commerce throughout the country.

I am glad to note that a tax and spending consciousness is developing today. Some day it will catch up with us, and then we will probably agree with President Coolidge, who said, "Make it do, use it up, or do without." I suppose when there is nothing left the country will have to do without, and then we will be getting in proper line.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I inquire how much time remains to the minority leader?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seven minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I merely wish to say that, I too, like the Senator from Illinois, feel somewhat frustrated and disappointed with the progress we are making in cutting appropriation bills. I cannot quite understand yet why Congress is so reluctant to go on record to postpone all nonessential public works projects. We put ceilings on prices, and we talk about shortages of construction materials, and at the same time we refuse to go on record in favor of the Government itself practicing economy as it preaches. We refuse to go on record in favor of the Government's stopping its food destruction program which every Member of the Senate knows is largely responsible for today's high cost of living.

This Eighty-second session of Congress is insisting upon a continuation of the Fair Deal reckless spending policy of the past 20 years. All caution has been thrown to the winds now that we have once again a balanced budget, but I cannot forget the fact that it will not stay balanced long at the rate we are going.

I remind you of the facts that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], a man for whom I have the greatest respect, last week, on June 30, for the first time since he has been a Member of the Senate—and he has been a Member of the Senate for 35 years—saw the political party of which he is a member balance the budget. Think of it, Mr. President. Thirty-five years without a balanced budget under the Democratic Party.

I wondered whether a failure to balance the budget had been a Democratic Party policy, so I checked back into the records; and I find that 23 years before 1916 or in 1893 the Democratic Party had balanced the budget. Then in 1917 the distinguished Senator from Tennessee entered the United States Senate and again 35 years later or in 1951 they once again lived within their income.

I am glad that the Senator from Tennessee was privileged to see at least one

balanced budget under his political party but this deficit spending policy; while it might win elections; it is hard on the American taxpayers.

The only balanced budgets we have had during the past 35 years, except this last, was under the Republican Party.

Mr. President, because the budget was balanced on June 30 last, it seems that now all caution has been thrown to the winds, and now the Congress proceeds to throw away money like a drunken sailor. At the present rate, and if the present spending policy is continued for another 35 years, apparently it will be 1986 before the budget will be balanced again, so far as the Democratic Party is concerned, and by that time we will be bankrupt.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware does not mean to imply that the Democratic Party will be in power until 1986, does he? [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. I hope not. Apparently if the New Deal administration is in power that long, it will not balance the budget until that time.

Although the Members of the Democratic Party make many speeches in favor of economy and in favor of lower taxes, yet year after year they keep spending and raising taxes.

I am speaking about the record; and the record shows that for the 23-year period between 1893 and 1916 and again for the 35-year period between 1916 and 1951, whenever the Democratic Party was in power, it actually balanced the budget only twice, and that was on last June 30, 1951, and in 1916. Now again today we see them launching another unlimited spending spree.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Delaware has expired.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I simply wish to join the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] in favor of Democratic tenure in power in the country for the next 35 years. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me say in my own time that I want it specifically understood that I am not going along until 1986. I am going along only until 1952; that is the limit to which I am going. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As the Senator from Illinois has said before, the legislative branch of the Government needs a good laugh now and then. However, this is not a laughing matter. This Government cannot stand 35 more years of the kind of government it has had for the past 20 years, so far as the Democratic Party is concerned. You have already driven half our retired people to the poor house through inflation, and I would be ashamed to laugh about it.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield one more minute to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I wish to say that it would not be a laughing matter if the Democratic Party were voted out; but if it were not so serious and tragic, it would be a laughing matter if the Republican Party were voted in. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield time to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is my time used up?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has half a minute remaining.

Mr. WHERRY. I merely wish to say that I observed that the Senator from Oklahoma hesitated almost half a minute before he could decide whether to say that it would be a laughing matter if the Democrats were voted out or that it would be a laughing matter if the Democrats were voted in; he really did not know which to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays, and first I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I withhold my suggestion of the absence of a quorum, if the yeas and nays are to be ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was a sufficient second of the request for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, they have been ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, Mr. President, we should have a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, inasmuch as the yeas and nays have been ordered, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended. I am the one who suggested the absence of a quorum, to start with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection to rescinding the order for a quorum call, but am I correct that the order would still stand for the yeas and nays on the question of the passage of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is, Shall the bill pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered. Mr. DIRKSEN rose.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in view of the fact that many Senators have been assured that there would be no more votes today, and they would be embarrassed by not being present if a vote were taken, may I ask the Senator from Illinois if he could not ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays be rescinded?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ask unanimous consent that the yeas-and-nays vote be postponed until next Tuesday, following the reconvening of the Senate. The Senators to whom the Senator from Arizona refers will be back by that time.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it is perfectly agreeable to me, but I should like to have a yeas-and-nays vote when the final vote is taken, inasmuch as the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I did not confer with the majority leader, and I did not know that this question as to the final vote would arise. I appeal to the distinguished majority leader, if he sees fit, to suggest that the final vote be postponed until after the Senate reconvenes next Tuesday, following the obtaining of a quorum. Every Senator will then be on notice. Senators who have left with the understanding that there would not be a vote may then vote next Tuesday after the Senate reconvenes, immediately following a quorum call. I simply make that suggestion to the distinguished majority leader, not in any way as an attempt to set the procedure of the Senate, but with the feeling that many Senators who are now absent ought to have an opportunity to express themselves.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I can see no objection to handling it in that manner. We could enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to have a yeas-and-nays vote on the final passage of the bill, after a quorum shall have been developed on Tuesday. It would take no longer to have a quorum call than now, and we can proceed today to the disposition of whatever other business we have to transact, and then recess.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the majority leader whether it is planned to continue to conduct the sessions throughout the remaining months of this year on the basis of about a 50 percent functioning of the Senate? We have had this bill before the Senate for 2 days more than 1 legislative week. Many of us, who represent States far removed from the Capital, remain in Washington with a sincere desire to discharge our legislative duties. The Senator from Idaho thinks it entirely unfair and unjust to the membership of this body to continue to operate as we have; for instance, to have one departmental appropriation bill before this body for more than a week. It is only the third appropriation bill which we have considered in this session. Seven or eight or nine other such bills are yet to be acted on. If we are to devote 10 days to each appropriation bill, recognizing that they constitute vital business which must be considered, it is not

difficult to understand that we cannot only fail to get a recess this summer, but that we can also fail to complete our agenda prior to New Year's Eve. I should like to have the distinguished majority leader give us some enlightenment on this point.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not know that I can enlighten the distinguished Senator from Idaho, but I want to say that I heartily agree with him that we ought to have passed this bill within 2 days. We spent altogether too much time on the bill, with discussion of a great many small amendments which should have been disposed of in committee. Formerly, we did not spend so much time on an appropriation bill. After all, what have we accomplished? I gave notice recently that Senators should be present, ready to vote, every day the Senate was in session. There is only one difficulty with the situation this afternoon, and that is that no Senator thought there was going to be a yea-and-nay vote. Certain Senators on both sides of the aisle were told there would not be, so it is unfortunate, and, so far as the junior Senator from Arizona is concerned, I desire now to give notice that on any day the Senate is in session there may be a yea-and-nay vote and that Senators should govern themselves accordingly.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I think I have the floor. Further reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the majority leader whether he can give the Senator from Idaho any assurances that there will be no yea-and-nay votes within the next 30 days? The Senator from Idaho would like to make a trip back home to attend to official business, and it would be very vital to know whether there would be any yea-and-nay votes within the next 30 days.

Mr. McFARLAND. I can give the Senator some assurance that there will be, if that will be helpful. I cannot give him any assurance that there will not be.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York would like to ask the junior Senator from Arizona, the distinguished majority leader, a question, in all sincerity. The Senator from New York is not criticizing delay in the procedure of the Senate, the delay in getting things done this year; and the Senator from New York realizes the causes of that delay, the various and sundry investigations which have held up committees so that they could not function as normally as they would otherwise. The Senator from New York feels that there has been provocation for the delay, and he can well understand how the session this year will have to continue into the fall, perhaps into the late fall.

The Senator from New York also feels that the Members of the Senate—and, for that matter, Members of the House, too, I assume—are under a great strain as the result of this continuous session,

which is proceeding without let-up, and it has occurred to the Senator from New York that, as a favor to Members of the Senate—of course the Members of the House can follow whatever procedure they desire as a favor to the Members of the Senate who like a little let-up now and then from the awful grind in the heat of the city of Washington, it may be well to have Fridays and Mondays considered as days upon which there will be no votes of any kind, so that our voting would be confined to Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays. I am talking now for the period between now and Labor Day, inclusive, and not thereafter.

Mr. McFARLAND. That would be very fine for the Senator from New York, who can return to his home in 4 hours.

Mr. IVES. No, the Senator from New York cannot. It does not allow him time enough.

Mr. McFARLAND. But the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] would not like it very well.

Mr. WELKER. Neither would I.

Mr. McFARLAND. As to those of us who live at great distances from Washington, it would not at all accommodate us. I realize it is a long session. I realize that the Senate has done a great deal of hard work. But in my humble opinion, some of the delays could have been avoided. I have tried to point out one method of shortening the session, namely, for Senators to be present on the floor of the Senate at 12 o'clock, when the Senate convenes. We lose one legislative day a week on quorum calls, because, as I have stated twice before, it requires an average of 20 minutes to call a quorum, and, since we have an average of three quorum calls a day, that adds up to 1 hour. In 5 days that means a legislative day of 5 hours. I hope we can speed up the session. I want to get home, too; but I am willing to remain here, because I feel that there is important work to be done. The defense of our country is at stake, and it behooves all of us to be present on every legislative day, in other words, at least 5 days a week.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think the Senate should proceed to vote. I will take the full responsibility—

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. I am willing to take full responsibility in regard to Senators whom I have told there would not be a yea-and-nay vote; but I shall insist on a quorum call. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggested the absence of a quorum because I wanted the bells to ring so that Senators who were in their offices could come into the Chamber and vote. I now ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for a vote on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS and Mr. UNDERWOOD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MOODY], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference in Geneva, Switzerland. If present the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent because of illness.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] has a general pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations has a general pair on this vote with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation, and if present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business, and, if present, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 4, as follows:

YEAS—64

Anderson	Holland	Millikin
Bennett	Hunt	Monroney
Bricker	Jenner	Morse
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Johnston, S. C.	Nixon
Cain	Kefauver	O'Connor
Capehart	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Kilgore	Robertson
Case	Knowland	Russell
Chavez	Langer	Saltonstall
Cordon	Lehman	Schoeppel
Duff	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Long	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Magnuson	Stennis
Eaton	Malone	Thye
Ferguson	Maybank	Watkins
Frear	McCarthy	Welker
George	McClellan	Wherry
Hayden	McFarland	Young
Hennings	McKellar	
Hill		

NAYS—4

Dirksen	Ives	Williams
Hendrickson		

NOT VOTING—28

Aiken	Gillette	Pastore
Benton	Green	Smathers
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Hoey	Sparkman
Clements	Humphrey	Taft
Connally	Martin	Tobey
Douglas	McCarran	Underwood
Ellender	McMahon	Wiley
Flanders	Moody	
Fulbright	Murray	

So the bill (H. R. 3790) was passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CORDON, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. YOUNG conferees on the part of the Senate.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 166, reported by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], from the Committee on Armed Services and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration on June 28, 1951, for which I ask immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I may say that the resolution carries \$10,000 for the Armed Services Committee to cover the expenses in connection with the MacArthur hearings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 166) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-second Congress, \$10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

PAYMENT FROM CONTINGENT FUND OF CERTAIN OBLIGATIONS BY SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 168, submitted by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] on June 29, 1951, for which I ask immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the funds for the Small Business Committee are to be taken care of when the next legislative appropriation bill is enacted by a regular appropriation. The sum provided in the resolution is necessary to carry the committee through until the regular appropriation bill shall be passed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, how much is asked for?

Mr. HAYDEN. Ten thousand dollars.

Mr. BRIDGES. How long is that supposed to carry the committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. The resolution provides "until the 1st of September or until the enactment of the legislative branch appropriation act, whichever is the earlier."

Mr. BRIDGES. Is not the amount carried in the resolution greatly in excess of the rate at which the committee has been spending money?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, it is not. The Committee on Rules and Administration held a hearing on the matter, and reported the resolution unanimously.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to assure the Senator from New Hampshire that the resolution carries only a temporary appropriation.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Consideration will be given to a regular appropriation of money for the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Arizona to the fact that all of the telegraph allowance of the Senator from North Dakota has been used up. It would be greatly appreciated by the Senator from North Dakota if the Senator from Arizona could figure out a way by which I could use for the sending of telegrams, some of the money provided for my use for clerk hire, and which I have not used, although thousands of dollars are available. There is no money available to me with which I can send telegrams to North Dakota in answer to farmers who send telegrams to me relating to farm problems, or in answer to some person who telephones me asking for advice about his son in the Army, or in answer to someone who presents some emergency problem to me. I hope the chairman of the committee will take the matter up in his commit-

tee to see if the average Senator cannot be afforded sufficient money to send telegrams which are necessary to be sent in answer to pleas received from his constituents and others. If the Senator will be good enough to take that matter up with his committee, I shall appreciate it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I shall be glad to take up the subject with the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments of the committee will be stated.

The amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration were, in line 6, after the word "committee", to insert "after June 30, 1951 and", and in the same line, after the word "to", to strike out "August 31" and insert "September 1."

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 168), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business created by Senate Resolution 58, agreed to February 20, 1950, is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, the sum of \$10,000 in addition to any other amount available to said committee, for the purpose of defraying obligations incurred by the said committee after June 30, 1951, and prior to September 1, 1951, or the date of enactment of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act of 1952, whichever is the earlier, in employing technical, clerical, and other assistance.

LIMITATION OF RETROACTIVE APPLICATION OF INCOME TAX TO EMPLOYEES IN THE CANAL ZONE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill which is wholly noncontroversial. I make the request because I have promised to bring up the bill, and I must be away from the Senate for some days, I do not know exactly for how long. I wish to live up to my obligation. The bill is House bill 3804, Calendar No. 474.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3804) to limit the retroactive application of the income tax to employees of the United States working in the possessions or in the Canal Zone.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the bill was unanimously reported by the Senate Finance Committee. In the Revenue Act of 1950, when we imposed the individual income tax upon the employees in the Canal Zone and other possessions, which includes, of course, civilian employees, Army and Navy employees, we recommended that it be effective from the first of the current year. The bill was not actually passed and did not become law until September 23 of last year. Consequently these persons, who have not heretofore been subject to tax, have now 2 years of taxes to pay.

The House would not agree to the Senate amendment in conference, and we had to recede in order to get a tax bill. But subsequently the House recognized the justice of this provision, and passed a separate bill, and that is now before the Senate with the full approval of the Finance Committee. It ought to be approved now because these employees are being subjected to the tax for 1950 and 1951; so it is 2 years tax in one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia a question. He stated that the bill was reported by the Finance Committee. Did the bill have the approval of the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], as well as other minority members of the committee?

Mr. GEORGE. It was reported unanimously by the members of the committee who were present, including the distinguished Senator from Colorado and other members on the minority side.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think the Senate should pass the bill immediately. I was in the Canal Zone some time ago, and found that a great deal of confusion existed among the employees there respecting the income tax. They want to know whether they must make certain payments. Last year the Senate passed a bill in form exactly like the bill now presented by the Senator from Georgia, passage of which he has now recommended. It failed to be enacted into law. If the bill is passed at this time, it will result in bringing considerable relief to the employees involved, and the state of confusion which I found to exist in the Canal Zone will be dissipated.

Mr. GEORGE. It is an eminently just measure. It should be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3804) to limit the retroactive application of the income tax to employees of the United States working in the possessions or in the Canal Zone was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL TUESDAY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SENATOR McCARTHY, THE MARINE

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington wishes to make reference to the recent utterances of one person and to talk about the record of another person. This task has not been imposed upon me by anyone. This is a task which I assume for good reason and with real enthusiasm.

If there is a single Member of the Senate of the United States who is better qualified or better able to protect and take care of himself under any and all circumstances than is the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], I do not know who that Member might be. JOE McCARTHY needs no help from me in defending himself. The man McCARTHY is possessed of courage which is

both moral and physical. Were I engaged in a knock-down drag-out fight with anybody, anywhere, I would be highly pleased to have the strength and courage of a friend, JOE McCARTHY, on my side.

I have not taken this floor to defend JOE McCARTHY. I have risen because he is my friend and because I wish to offer a portion of his established record to the Senate. The references I shall make are those which, under no circumstances, JOE McCARTHY would make about himself.

It is known throughout the Nation that Drew Pearson does not think highly of JOE McCARTHY. I would find it difficult to define a greater understatement than I have just offered. On one occasion in the recent past, Drew Pearson and JOE McCARTHY resorted to a mild game of violence between themselves. Mr. Pearson would be the very last to deny that he was overmatched.

Mr. Pearson may continue to say harsh things about JOE McCARTHY but Pearson has become a very cautious man, and anything he says will be hurled at a safe distance.

Mr. Pearson, who is suing JOE McCARTHY about something or other, has spoken about the Senator from Wisconsin on three recent national broadcasts. The dates were June 17, June 24, and July 8. These broadcasts were heard by millions of Americans and probably by many people overseas. These broadcasts were designed to stigmatize and besmirch the war record of a splendid American.

Until the Pearson broadcast of July 8, I had only known that JOE McCARTHY had seen service as a marine in World War II. It never occurred to me that JOE McCARTHY had been anything other than a first-rate and fighting marine. One has a good habit of taking for granted that every marine is a top-flight American.

Following the Pearson broadcast of July 8, I sought to determine what Pearson was talking about. I secured copies of the three Pearson broadcasts and I secured JOE McCARTHY's official record as a marine.

It may be said in passing, and presumably it could be of benefit to others among our colleagues, that whenever one is desirous of obtaining the transcript of a national broadcast it can be obtained, as the Pearson broadcasts were obtained, through Radio Reports, Inc., 220 East Forty-second Street, New York 17, N. Y. Should anyone wish to call them in a hurry by telephone, as is sometimes necessary, the telephone number is Murray Hill 7-6658.

Mr. President, the Senator from Washington wants the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to carry JOE McCARTHY's record as a marine. It gives me great personal satisfaction to place that record where it may be read by those who are JOE McCARTHY's friends and enemies and by those who know him only as an important though controversial figure in American political life today. I would do this for any person whose reputation had been assailed without cause. I receive a deep personal thrill in doing this out of my affection for a friend.

Let me first offer what Mr. Pearson said about my friend from Wisconsin at 6 p. m. on the evening of June 17 over WJZ of New York and the ABC network.

The title of this portion of the broadcast as it came to me from Radio Reports, Inc., is "Pearson compares military records of McCARTHY and Marshall." I read from the transcript of the broadcast:

Now, Keeping the Records Straight Department: Last week a so-called gentleman from Wisconsin stood up in the Senate, and from the safety of his Senate immunity threw 60,000 words of oral mud at Secretary of Defense Marshall. And, in order to keep the records straight, I would like to compare the military record of the mud slinger who spent his time trying to get out of the marines, and the man he smeared, who continued to serve his country.

George Marshall did not have enough political pull even to get into West Point. He entered the Army through V. M. I. The man who smeared him had his political friends write letters to the Marine Corps in order to get a commission.

Bear in mind that some 20,000,000 people are listening to a man by the name of Pearson, who says that what he is stating is a fact.

In the first war, Capt. George Marshall, then on Pershing's staff, planned one of the greatest military maneuvers in history—the transfer of the entire American Army from St. Mihiel to the Argonne in a week's time, without the enemy knowing it. For this he got no publicity and sought none. In World War II, the other captain publicized himself as a tail gunner and as taking part in 17 missions in the South Pacific. Navy Department files, however, fail to show any record of combat missions.

Parenthetically, as of this time Mr. Pearson is endeavoring to establish that our friend from Wisconsin lies, and that he is a coward.

But they do show that on October 1944, during the heat of the war, Capt. JOE McCARTHY demanded leave to return to Wisconsin. At that time two trucks and a jeep on the island of Bougainville carried signs announcing McCARTHY for Senator. He had already begun to use his military service as a springboard for politics. In February 1945, with the war still desperately fought in the Pacific, Captain McCARTHY resigned. Few other officers were permitted to resign in wartime except for cause. In McCARTHY's file as a Reserve officer today, there is a red card which says: "This officer cannot be assigned to active duty."

Parenthetically, again, here Mr. Pearson is attempting to establish that there is a Red card which dilutes the red and blue blood and American courage in the veins of this man called McCARTHY.

In contrast, George Marshall, having spent 50 years in the service of his country—half a century—was enjoying retirement at Leesburg, Va., when he was recalled to active duty. There was no Red card in George Marshall's file, and he never would have permitted one to be there. That is the man whom the cellophane commission Senator from Wisconsin charged with selling his country to communism.

Gen. George Marshall is no part of my story, but Pearson dragged him in and he must go along for the ride. I respect General Marshall, the soldier. This is no place to discuss General Marshall, a Secretary of State and special representative of a President.

given why this agency is singled out for attack. It has not abused its authority. Why substitute for the present Board an administrative organization which is wasteful and inefficient, and makes more difficult of solution the pressing national problems of wage stabilization and dispute settlement? Why disregard the tripartite principle? In all its provisions, it destroys experience. For these reasons I urge rejection of the amendment.

(Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, the opposition to the Lucas amendment has centered their attack on LUCAS rather than on the amendment, but I can stand any complaint they may have against me. I am perfectly willing to stand on my record.

In this instance I am standing for the public rather than the selfish interests. In this fight I am opposed by the CIO, A. F. of L., and the NAM. Now what better opponents could I have?

I want stronger controls in the interests of the public in this inflation legislation. After all, are not those not members of AFL, CIO, and NAM entitled to some consideration by this House? I heard the gentleman from Tennessee say that we were crying "Wolf, wolf." His memory is very short if he praises the War Labor Board as having a magnificent record. He forgets the Montgomery Ward case where they ordered seized a retail store as a national defense establishment. He forgets the S. A. Woods Co. case, where they went in and seized a company which had not had a strike in 90 years, and which had only a minor dispute at one of its plants not engaged in national defense activities, yet the War Labor Board seized it and gave it over to another company to operate. The War Department later acknowledged the evil of the act and paid compensation to the company for the damages suffered during this outrageous seizure. No, my colleagues, I cannot forget what happened during the last war.

Now, will the big labor unions use this new set-up to achieve their ends? Here is an example of what will happen.

Let me read to you a statement distributed to its members by a labor union in California:

JUNE 5, 1951.

We have just sent your employer notice of opening our contract for wages and other working conditions.

Now that labor representatives have rejoined the Wage Stabilization Board, they now have authority to handle and make decisions pertaining to other issues besides wages, such as holidays with pay, union shop, and maintenance of membership, a decent grievance procedure, and other working conditions.

As the rules governing wage stabilization stand now in Washington, D. C., they can make decisions on any issue that labor and management cannot agree on in negotiations.

Let's go, boys, we have been waiting a long time for this.

And it was signed by the labor-union official. I invite you to see it. It is genuine.

Are we so blind that we cannot foretell what will happen if this successor to the War Labor Board is invested with these powers? Think, my friends, of your small-business man. Think of your independent labor unions, and, yes, do not forget to remember that we should be legislating for the consuming public. Is your responsibility to the unions? To management? No; I remind you, it is to the public at large.

My memory is not so short I have forgotten exactly what happened during the last war when our fellows were dying in the front lines and this War Labor Board converted our system of collective bargaining into compulsory arbitration, and it was always against the interests of the public, the little man, the unorganized, the undefended. Can you wonder that our veterans gave first attention to strengthening our labor laws?

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am proud to stand up here for the public against the organized selfish interests in this country. I refuse to be intimidated by the pressures brought to bear on the House by the special interests, by those, mind you, who are not only disregarding the interests of the housewives—the consuming public—but who are establishing a system within our Government entirely foreign to our constitutional system.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

(Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. DEANE addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I have not heard any substantial criticism of the present Wage Stabilization Board in all this debate. These amendments attempt to substitute a Board without power, that can settle no disputes, in place of the present Board which I think has operated in a very satisfactory manner.

No one has brought forth any argument worthy of consideration against that Board.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I think that the few statements the author of the original amendment, the Lucas amendment, just made indicates to us very clearly his position in this particular matter when he stood before us and said he is against the CIO and that he is against the AFL. This clearly indicates the true purpose of his amendment. Certainly I have a great deal of respect and admiration for the gentleman from Texas and for the other people that support these issues, but they all remind me of the fellow who sold a blind horse to

the farmer. When the horse walked into the barn the farmer said to the city slicker, "Why, that horse is blind." He said, "No, he is not blind; he just don't give a damn."

There is no difference between the Kersten amendment and the Lucas amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I demand that those words be taken down. That is a reflection on the Members of the House who are in favor of this amendment, that is, the statement just made there that those who oppose labor just do not give a damn.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read the words objected to.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make it clear that it was not my intention to impugn any of the motives, and I think I expressed that previous to the point that has been raised.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to withdraw his words?

Mr. GREEN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3871) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes, certain words used in debate were objected to and on request were taken down and read at the Clerk's desk, and he herewith reported the same to the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read the words objected to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is bound to hold that the using of words like those just used by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, or any other words bordering on profanity, is a violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those words be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3871, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania to complete his statement.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to express my apology to the Members of the House for any violating of the rules of the House. It was not my intention to do so.

The only point I want to bring out is this. There is no difference between

the Lucas amendment and the Kersten amendment. They both mean one thing, industrial war, strikes, and unrest. And none of us want that. The gentleman from Arkansas said that we have had only a little bit of time to debate this thing, and that the only people that know anything about it are the Labor Committee. It is an amazing thing to me that we are saddled with an amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN], who is a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

I certainly hope that both these amendments are defeated, and that we leave the Wage Stabilization Board as it presently exists.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on the amendment and the substitute.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin), there were—ayes 135, noes 140.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin and Mr. PATMAN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 152, noes 190.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. LUCAS and Mr. PATMAN.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 113, noes 217.

So the amendment was rejected.

[Mr. IRVING addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3871) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KIRWAN, NORRELL, JACKSON of Washington, FURCOLO, CANNON, JENSEN, FENTON, and TABER.

HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE HAS DISRUPTED BLACK-MARKET AND PREMIUM-PRICE OPERATIONS—FIELD HEARINGS OF COMMITTEE HAVE UNCOVERED EVIDENCE WHICH HAS BEEN CHANNELLED TO THE OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION FOR ACTION—PRICE STABILIZATION CANNOT BE EFFECTIVE UNLESS IT INCLUDES AUTHORITY TO CURB PREMIUM PRICES

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include a newspaper article.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past few months the House Small Business Committee has been performing an effective job in fighting black and gray markets in metals and other materials which are basic to our economy.

Every member should be informed regarding this aspect of the committee's activity, since the control of illegal and premium prices is an essential phase of the price stabilization program. Certainly price stabilization cannot be effective if a portion of the supply of basic materials is sold at prices far above the normal market levels. Not only price stabilization, but the entire program of fair allocation of scarce materials, depends upon the ability to control premium prices.

During the present session of Congress, Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Small Business Committee has held field hearings in 24 States. It is no exaggeration to say that the committee has found evidence of black and gray market prices in every locality it has visited. Small-business men throughout the Nation have been experiencing extreme difficulty in obtaining adequate supplies of basic materials from their normal sources. At the same time, they have been deluged with offers of large quantities of steel, aluminum, chemicals, and other scarce materials at prices ranging from 100 to 500 percent above the market levels.

The committee has gathered a mass of evidence on this subject. This evidence has been turned over to Mr. Leo McCormick, assistant to Price Stabilizer DiSalle, for appropriate action. Mr. McCormick has attended virtually all of the field hearings conducted by the committee, and he has displayed great in-

terest in curbing the activities of the black and gray marketeers who are preying on the business community. There have been a number of indications that the hearings have focused the spotlight on premium-price brokers and have forced them to curtail their operations. In particular, I should like to call your attention to an article in the June 27 issue of the Wall Street Journal titled, "Gray Market Prices Weaken as Civilian Output is Cut Back," which, by unanimous consent, I inserted at the end of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the committee has received evidence from small-business witnesses showing prices for steel ranging up to \$21 per hundredweight, while the current mill prices for the same type of steel were \$6 per hundredweight. Steel which was selling at \$8 at the mill was offered as high as \$30 by premium-price brokers. Although the situation appears to be most critical in steel, the committee has received evidence indicating that much the same conditions prevail in chemicals, aluminum, copper, and other items in scarce supply. Instances were brought to the attention of the committee of chemicals selling at 30 cents a pound by the manufacturer, offered at as high as 90 cents a pound by these fringe operators.

In this connection, I should like to call your attention to the printed hearings of Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Small Business Committee in Chicago on May 11 and 12 on Problems of Small Manufacturers of Farm Equipment and Machinery as Related to the National Emergency. Since nearly all small manufacturers of farm equipment are dependent upon steel supplies, evidence regarding premium prices in steel came out particularly clearly in these hearings.

At the hearings to which I have referred, Mr. Wendell E. Butler, president of the Allied Farm Equipment Manufacturers Association, stated:

The black market in steel today exists in even a larger form and on a more disastrous basis today than it ever did during the days of World War II.

Mr. Butler went on to say:

While we, as small manufacturers, are constantly being refused steel at our normal sources of supply, while we are being told by the steel mills and the steel warehouses that they have no steel for us, we are daily being offered seemingly unlimited quantities of steel of all types and kinds by people who call themselves steel brokers, and who ask us to pay prices amounting to four and five times the regular mill price for our materials.

Mr. Butler testified that his own firm had paid \$65,000 in premiums for steel, above and beyond the normal mill price, during the last 6 months of 1950 alone. Another witness testified that his company's steel requirements for the remainder of 1951 would cost \$1,165,000 above the normal mill price if the company is forced to rely on the so-called open market. These conditions are not confined to the farm-equipment field, but are common to small manufacturing throughout the Nation.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

JULY 30, 1951.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. KIRWAN, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 3790]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 17, 25, 103, 109, and 130.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 60, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, and 125 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$200,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert *four*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: *of which not to exceed \$8,387,470 shall be available for personal services, except force account personal services, and;* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: *twenty-nine;* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$41,824,750; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: *one hundred and sixty passenger motor vehicles for replacement only;* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$4,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert the following: \$4,234,553; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$3,810,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$202,767,725; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert the following: \$38,104,672; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert the following: \$10,698,514; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$6,678,196; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 126:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "or", insert *by it*; and in line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "persons", insert *which*; and at the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, and before the period, insert : *Provided, That this section shall not be construed as having application to the preparation for publication of reports and maps resulting from authorized scientific and engineering investigations and surveys, to photography incident to the compilation and reproduction of maps and reports, or to photocopying of permanent records for preservation*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 127:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government in the District of Columbia whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance and two passenger motor vehicles assigned one to the Secretary and one to the Under Secretary), unless such appropriation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the compensation of employees performing such duties.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lines 4 and 5 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the words "one hundred and fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof the following: *one hundred and ten*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 131:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Omit the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 4, 5, 8, 10½, 14, 24, 40, 53, 57, 61, 62, 63, 72, 75, 83, 108, 124, and 129.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
FOSTER FURCOLO,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN (except
as to amendment No. 131),
IVOR D. FENTON (except
as to amendment No. 131),
Managers on the Part of the House.
CARL HAYDEN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
PAT McCARRAN,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
GUY CORDON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

ENFORCEMENT OF CONNALLY HOT OIL ACT

Amendment No. 1—*Expenses*: Appropriates \$158,670 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$174,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Provides that not to exceed \$137,970 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Amendments Nos. 3, 4, and 5—*Construction*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 6—*Operation and maintenance*: Appropriates \$200,000, instead of \$275,000 as proposed by the House and \$125,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7—*Administrative provisions*: Authorizes the purchase of four automobiles, instead of five as proposed by the House and three as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8—*Continuing fund*: Reported in disagreement.

CONSTRUCTION, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$3,375,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$2,564,400 as proposed by the Senate. This action provides within the total amount appropriated the sum of \$500,000 for miscellaneous construction, \$250,000 for the purchase of electric power and energy and for leasing of transmission facilities of others, and \$810,600 for continuation of construction of the facilities designated as comprising the western Missouri project.

With respect to the western Missouri project, it is expected that a determined effort will be made by the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate with the private utilities to obtain a contract that will make unnecessary the use of this appropriation for such project and that no new obligation will be incurred under authority of this appropriation for such project unless the Secretary of the Interior determines, after such negotiations, that additional facilities of such project are required to be constructed by the Government for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer.

Amendment No. 10: Provides that not to exceed \$586,800 of the construction appropriation shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10½: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 11: Strikes out the limitation upon the use of funds for construction of the western Missouri project, as proposed by the Senate.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$1,255,712 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,275,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13: Provides that not to exceed \$900,712 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FACILITIES, DENISON DAM PROJECT

Amendment No. 14: Reported in disagreement.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 15: Authorizes the purchase of 8 automobiles as proposed by the Senate, instead of 15 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: Strikes out unnecessary language.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Amendment No. 17—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$20,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$14,530 as proposed by the Senate.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$67,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$62,000,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees have agreed to defer action on the La Grande-Baker line owing to incomplete information indicating its immediate need. It is suggested that the Department make a further study and resubmit the authorization when more complete information is available.

Amendment No. 19: Provides that not to exceed \$8,387,470 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate, with the modification agreed to by the conferees that force account personal services shall not be included within this limitation.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$5,368,439 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,250,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21: Provides that not to exceed \$3,983,862 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Amendment No. 22: Strikes out unnecessary language.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 23—*Management of lands and resources*: Appropriates \$7,722,605, deletes earmarking of funds for soil and moisture conservation, and provides that not to exceed \$4,864,096 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate; instead of making an appropriation of \$6,900,000 without a limitation on personal services, as proposed by the House. This action ratifies the Senate approval of \$1,200,000 for soil and moisture conservation, even though it will not be earmarked in the bill.

Amendment No. 24—*Construction*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 25: Deletes the proposal of the Senate to amend the basic law relating to the distribution of receipts from sale of timber from the revested Oregon and California grant lands.

Amendment No. 26—*Administrative provisions*: Authorizes the purchase of 29 automobiles, instead of 32 as proposed by the House and 25 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Amendment No. 27—*Salaries and expenses*: Deletes the paragraph making one appropriation of \$65,000,000 for all of the activities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, as proposed by the Senate.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE SERVICES

Amendment No. 28: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 29: Deletes an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates \$41,824,750, instead of \$43,600,000 as proposed by the House and \$41,324,750 as proposed by the Senate. The amount approved for health, education, and welfare services includes \$400,000 to continue public assistance contributions to Indians in Arizona, and an additional \$100,000 for placement services, making a total of \$600,000 for placement services.

Amendment No. 31: Provides that not to exceed \$23,699,661 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate. In approving this limitation it is the intention of the conferees that it not be applied against the budgeted amounts for personal services of medical personnel, school teachers, and others essential to the hospital, disease preventative, and curative services and the educational assistance programs.

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 32: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 33: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates \$10,921,360 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$11,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35: Provides that not to exceed \$6,843,485 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 36: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 37: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$12,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 39: Provides that not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Reported in disagreement.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Amendment No. 41: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 42: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates \$3,300,747 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 44: Provides that not to exceed \$2,693,281 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

REVOLVING FUND FOR LOANS

Amendment No. 45: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 46: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

PAYMENT TO CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW NATIONS OF INDIANS, OKLAHOMA

Amendment No. 47: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 48: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates \$22,655 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$25,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 50: Provides that not to exceed \$21,105 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 51: Authorizes the purchase of 160 automobiles, instead of 191 as proposed by the House and 125 as proposed by the Senate.

TRIBAL FUNDS

Amendment No. 52: Makes a grammatical change.

Amendment No. 53: Reported in disagreement.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates \$4,500,000, instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,600,000 as proposed by the Senate. This action ratifies the action of the Senate in approving \$100,000 for investigations of the Collbran project, Colorado.

Amendment No. 55: Provides that not to exceed \$4,234,553 shall be available for personal services, instead of \$3,163,396 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56: Provides that \$3,810,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund, instead of \$3,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,903,500 as proposed by the Senate.

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

Amendment No. 57: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 58: Appropriates \$202,767,725, instead of \$197,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$208,535,450 as proposed by the Senate. The allotment of the appropriation to the projects covered by the budget estimates is left to the administrative determination of the Secretary of the Interior with the understanding that funds will not be allocated in excess of the respective sums indicated in column 4 of the project breakdown appearing at pages 15 and 16 of Senate Report No. 499, and that there will be no allocation of current year or prior appropriations for any project item not heretofore appropriated for or included in the fiscal 1952 program presented to Congress or for any project item eliminated by the action of the House, the Senate, or both, upon the budget estimates, with the following exceptions: The managers on the part of the both Houses agree that of the 1952 appropriation \$191,000 is to be available for operation and maintenance of the All-American Canal, as provided for in the Senate report; that \$500,000 is to be available for the initiation of construction of a single circuit 230-kilovolt transmission line, for other than customer service, from Folsom Dam power plant to interconnect at the nearest feasible point with the east side Shasta-Tracy transmission line; that the Secretary should make available from unobligated balances of prior appropriations approximately \$1,463,000 for emergency work on the Middle Rio Grande project, New Mexico; and that the proposed allocation of an additional \$185,000 to the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, is not approved.

It is to be understood that this action by the conferees expressly denies any appropriation for the following transmission facilities:

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

	<i>Amount of 1952 estimate</i>
Keswick-Tracy via Elverta 115-kilovolt line-----	\$1, 400, 000
Port Chicago-Mare Island 115-kilovolt line and 2 substations-----	300, 000
Tracy-Patterson-Naval Supply 69-kilovolt line and 2 substations---	450, 000
CVP-BPA interconnection and substation, 230-kilovolt, including \$400,000 contained in S. Doc. 39-----	2, 100, 000
Tracy-Livermore-Ames Laboratory line and substation-----	700, 000
Tracy-Contra Costa-Clayton-Ygnacio 69-kilovolt line and 2 substa- tions-----	201, 170
Keswick-Shasta Dam area PUD 115-kilovolt line and substation----	105, 308
Elverta-Sacramento switchyard-----	150, 000
Total 1952 estimate disallowed-----	5, 406, 478

COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT, COLORADO

The \$100,000 included in the 1952 budget estimates for the Estes-Leyner 115-kilovolt transmission line has been disallowed, but for the Estes power plant-Pole Hill power plant 115-kilovolt line \$100,000 has been approved for the 1952 program.

MINIDOKA PROJECT, AMERICAN FALLS POWER DIVISION, IDAHO

	<i>Amount of 1952 estimate</i>
American Falls power plant.....	\$1, 067, 000
American Falls switchyard.....	133, 000
Transmission line (American Falls-Minidoka Dam).....	100, 000
Total 1952 estimate disallowed.....	1, 300, 000

	<i>Amount of 1952 estimate</i>
TRANSMISSION DIVISION, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN	
Canyon Ferry-Great Falls 115-kilovolt line and substation.....	\$753, 450
Canyon Ferry-Three Forks-Anaconda 115-kilovolt lines and sub- stations.....	703, 000
Miles City-Yellowtail 115-kilovolt lines and substations.....	85, 000
Yellowtail-Billings 115-kilovolt lines and substations.....	810, 000
Sioux City-Omaha line.....	207, 463
Omaha substation.....	70, 242
Sioux City-Storm Lake line.....	118, 428
Storm Lake-Denison-Holland-Omaha line.....	30, 624
Sioux City-Sibley line.....	467, 643
Additional reduction.....	500, 490
Total 1952 estimate disallowed.....	3, 746, 340

The managers on the part of both Houses strongly reaffirm the language contained in the House committee report accompanying H. R. 3790 with reference to prohibiting the proposed interconnection of the Central Valley power system and the Bonneville power system. Reports have been received that work on the proposed intertie has continued despite the categoric denial in the reports issued by the Appropriations Committees of both the House and the Senate this year and approved by both Houses of Congress, and a similar categoric injunction last year approved by both Houses of Congress denying the use of funds for this purpose.

The conferees hereby request the Secretary of the Interior to submit immediately a full and complete report including disciplinary action taken by him in this case.

Amendment No. 59: Provides that not to exceed \$38,104,672 shall be available for personal services, instead of \$29,160,408 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 60: Provides that \$28,972,650 shall be derived from the reclamation fund as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$29,202,200 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 61: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 62: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 63: Reported in disagreement.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Amendment No. 64: Appropriates \$15,977,594 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$15,094,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 65: Strikes out unnecessary words.

Amendment No. 66: Provides that \$12,476,494 shall be derived from the reclamation fund as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$12,592,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 67: Strikes out unnecessary words.

Amendment No. 68: Provides that not to exceed \$10,698,514 shall be available for personal services, instead of \$10,331,434 as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Amendment No. 69: Appropriates \$5,478,203 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 70: Provides that not to exceed \$4,696,178 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

EMERGENCY FUND

Amendment No. 71: Appropriates \$400,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$500,000 as proposed by the House.

TRANSFER OF FACILITIES, FORT PECK PROJECT, MONTANA

Amendment No. 72: Reported in disagreement.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 73: Authorizes not to exceed \$50,000 for consultant services as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$30,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 74: Increases to \$100 per day the amount that can be paid for consultant services as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$50 per day as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 75: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 76 and 77: Strike out limitations inserted by the House, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, and 83—*Coachella distribution system*: Authorize expenditures of not to exceed \$2,783,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of not to exceed \$1,684,000 as proposed by the House, for completion of construction of the Coachella division of the All-American Canal system; make the expenditure of such funds mandatory as proposed by the Senate, instead of permissive as proposed by the House; and instead of requiring a definite repayment arrangement in advance of expenditure as proposed by the House, adopt the proposal of the Senate that such expenditure shall be repayable unless it shall be judicially determined by a court of competent jurisdiction that the irrigation district is not liable therefor. Amendment No. 83 is reported in disagreement.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Amendment No. 84: Appropriates \$21,300,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$21,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 85: Provides that not to exceed \$13,455,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF MINES

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES

Amendment No. 86: Appropriates \$16,858,603 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$17,950,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees have approved \$356,000 for control of fires in inactive coal deposits, such sum to be absorbed from the total appropriation

approved for the conservation and development of mineral resources. The entire amount of the budget estimate for engineering and other research on the development and production of petroleum and natural gas has been approved by the conferees. No reduction is to be made in the sums to be available for personal services with respect to the two afore-mentioned activities: \$91,775 is to be available for personal services at the Laramie Station and \$545,572 is to be available for personal services at the Bartletttsville Station.

Amendment No. 87: Provides that not to exceed \$10,446,575 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 88: Appropriates \$1,587,412 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,250,000 as proposed by the House. This action includes approval of \$350,000 for completion of the pilot plant started during World War II at Laramie, Wyo., for research by the Bureau of Mines on the production of alumina from low-grade ores. The ores to be experimented with are different from bauxite ores found in other areas of the country. In approving this appropriation it is the intent of the conferees that, even though the experimental operations will not be financed from this appropriation, no research shall be conducted at this station on processes or methods, whether patented or not, unless all royalty and other beneficial rights to developments or discoveries from such research accrue exclusively to the Government.

Amendment No. 89: Provides that not to exceed \$113,287 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Amendment No. 90: Appropriates \$1,176,841 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,290,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 91: Provides that not to exceed \$1,018,434 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

Amendment No. 92: Provides that not to exceed \$6,584,342 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

Amendment No. 93: Appropriates \$7,369,790 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$7,300,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 94: Provides that not to exceed \$4,193,747 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 95: Appropriates \$11,370,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$11,975,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 96: Provides that not to exceed \$945,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Amendment No. 97: Appropriates \$1,171,774 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,284,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 98: Provides that not to exceed \$1,014,538 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES

Amendment No. 99: Appropriates \$6,678,196, instead of \$6,870,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,606,558 as proposed by the Senate. This action restores the amount of \$263,442 contained in the budget estimate for river basin studies except that the entire sum appropriated is to be subject to the reduction in funds to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 100: Provides that not to exceed \$4,259,363 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

Amendment No. 101: Appropriates \$3,858,986 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,875,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 102: Provides that not to exceed \$2,487,629 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 103: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to prevent the use of this appropriation for investigations, surveys, and similar work in foreign countries.

CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 104: Appropriates \$733,742 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$750,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 105: Provides that not to exceed \$146,324 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Amendment No. 106: Appropriates \$806,631 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$882,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 107: Provides that not to exceed \$678,319 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

Amendment No. 108—*Administration of Territories*: Reported in disagreement.

ALASKA PUBLIC WORKS

Amendment No. 109: Appropriates \$7,000,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$8,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 110: Provides that not to exceed \$463,000 shall be available for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$500,000 for this purpose as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 111: Provides that not to exceed \$333,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

CONSTRUCTION OF ROADS, ALASKA

Amendment No. 112: Provides that not to exceed \$2,493,000 shall be available for personal services, as provided by the Senate.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF ROADS, ALASKA

Amendment No. 113: Appropriates \$2,900,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 114: Provides that not to exceed \$1,935,840 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS (ALASKA ROAD COMMISSION)

Amendment No. 115: Provides that not to exceed 20 percent of the construction appropriation be available for force account work as proposed by the Senate, instead of not to exceed 25 percent as proposed by the House.

VIRGIN ISLANDS PUBLIC WORKS

Amendment No. 116: Appropriates \$992,970 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 117: Provides that not to exceed \$63,270 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 118: Inserts a proviso that no part of the appropriation shall be used for waterfront development work on St. Thomas and provides that the amount included in the 1952 budget estimates for such work be made available for school and hospital facilities, as proposed by the Senate.

ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Amendment No. 119: *Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary:* Appropriates \$2,154,911 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 120: Provides that not to exceed \$1,890,798 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

RESCISSION OF UNUSED CONTRACT AUTHORITY

Amendment No. 121: Strikes out the word "unused" and in lieu thereof inserts the word "unobligated", as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 122: Changes the effective date of the rescission from June 30, 1951, as proposed by the House, to June 30, 1952, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 123: Adopts the Senate proposal to strike out the words "except public works in the Virgin Islands".

TRANSFERS OF PROPERTY—OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

Amendment No. 124: Reported in disagreement.

VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

Amendment No. 125: Appropriates \$2,595,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,800,000 as proposed by the House.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

EXPENDITURES FOR INFORMATIONAL AND PROPAGANDA PURPOSES

Amendment No. 126: Strikes out the proposal of the House for limiting the use of funds for propaganda purposes, and adopts the proposal of the Senate to impose limitations upon expenditures for such purposes; but modifies the Senate proposal by adding at the end thereof a provision that the limitation shall not apply to the publication of reports and maps resulting from authorized scientific and engineering investigations and surveys or to photography incident to the compilation and reproduction of maps and reports or to photocopying of permanent records for preservation.

LIMITATION ON EMPLOYMENT OF CHAUFFEURS

Amendment No. 127: Adopts the amendment of the Senate limiting the employment of chauffeurs of Government-owned cars, but restricts its operation to the District of Columbia and excepts the automobile assigned to the Secretary and that assigned to the Under Secretary.

EMPLOYEES ENGAGED IN PERSONNEL WORK

Amendment No. 128: Adopts the amendment of the Senate limiting the number of persons to be engaged in personnel work, but changes the proposed ratio of 1 such employee to 115 employees to 1 such employee to 110 employees.

ANTISTRIKE PROVISION

Amendment No. 129: Reported in disagreement.

EXPENDITURES DURING FINAL QUARTER OF FISCAL YEAR

Amendment No. 130: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to limit the expenditures for certain purposes during the last quarter of the fiscal year to not to exceed the average quarterly amount of such expenditures during the preceding three quarters of the fiscal year, except where the Director of the Bureau of the Budget authorizes otherwise. It is the intention of the conferees that excessive last-quarter purchases be prevented so that accumulated last-quarter balances revert to the Treasury.

LIMITATION ON FILLING VACANCIES

Amendment No. 131: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the Jensen amendment which was inserted by the House and also strikes out the proposal of the Senate to add a provision which would enumerate reductions already made in the various paragraphs throughout the bill as a substitute for the Jensen amendment. The conferees have agreed to amendments to the House bill which have the total effect of reducing the sums available for personal services by \$13,841,606 below the amount requested in the Budget for 1952 for such purposes.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
FOSTER FURCOLO,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN (except
as to amendment No. 131),
IVOR D. FENTON (except
as to amendment No. 131),
Managers on the Part of the House.

○

Mahon
Mansfield
Marshall
Meader
Merrow
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Mitchell
Morano
Morris
Morrison
Multer
Mumma
Murdock
Murphy
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Konski
Ostertag
O'Toole
Passman
Patman
Patterson
Philbin
Poage
Polk
Potter
Powell
Price
Priest
Prouty
Quinn

Radwan
Rains
Ramsay
Reams
Rees, Kans.
Rhodes
Ribicoff
Richards
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers
Roberts
Robeson
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rooney
Sabath
Sadlak
St. George
Sasser
Scott, Hardie
Scudder
Secrest
Seely-Brown
Shelley
Sheppard
Sieminski
Sikes
Smith, Va.
Spence
Staggers
Stanley
Steed

Stigler
Stockman
Sutton
Tackett
Talle
Taylor
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Towe
Trimble
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vaughn
Vorys
Walter
Weichel
Welch
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Wier
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Winstead
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolverton
Yates
Yorty
Zablocki

NAYS—80

Abernethy
Allen, Ill.
Anderson, Calif.
Andrews
Bailey
Belcher
Berry
Betts
Bishop
Bow
Bramblett
Brown, Ohio
Buffett
Burleson
Chipperfield
Church
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Crawford
Cunningham
Curtis, Nebr.
Dolliver
Dorn
Fellows
Fisher
Furcolo
Gossett

Gross
Gwinn
Hagen
Harrison, Wyo.
Harvey
Hillings
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Jenison
Jenkins
Jensen
Kearns
Lovre
Lucas
McGregor
Martin, Iowa
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Nelson
Nicholson
O'Hara
Patten
Phillips
Pickett
Rankin
Reece, Tenn.

Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Regan
Rogers, Tex.
Schwabe
Scrivner
Shafer
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sittler
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stefan
Teague
Thompson, Mich.
Vall
Velde
Vursell
Werdell
Wheeler
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Wood, Idaho
Woodruff

NOT VOTING—59

Anfuso
Armstrong
Baring
Bender
Bonner
Bosone
Bray
Breen
Brehm
Brooks
Brownson
Busbey
Camp
Chatham
Chenoweth
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Denton
Dingell
Durham
Eberharter

Ellsworth
Engle
Evins
Gillette
Golden
Hale
Hall
Edwin Arthur
Irving
Kennedy
Kilburn
Lane
Latham
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Morgan
Morton
Moulder
Murray, Tenn.

Murray, Wis.
O'Neill
Perkins
Poulson
Preston
Rabaut
Redden
Roosevelt
Saylor
Scott
Hugh D., Jr.
Sheehan
Smith, Kans.
Taber
Vinson
Watts
Wharton
Whitaker
Wood, Ga.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Sheehan against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Mason against.
Mr. Denton for, with Mr. Smith of Kansas against.

Mr. Latham for, with Mr. Gillette against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Evins with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Engle with Mr. Poulson.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Hale.
Mr. Camp with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Preston with Mr. Brownson.
Mr. Wood of Georgia with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Perkins with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Redden with Mr. Busbey.
Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Armstrong.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Bender.

Mr. Bow changed his vote from yea to nay.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 3790, the Interior Department appropriation bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 775)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 17, 25, 103, 109, and 130.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 60, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, and 125, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "four"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "of which not to exceed \$8,387,470 shall be available for personal services, except force account personal services, and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "twenty-nine"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$41,824,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "one hundred and sixty passenger motor vehicles for replacement only"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert the following: "\$4,234,533"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,810,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$202,767,725"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert the following: "\$38,104,672"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert the following: "\$10,698,514"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "\$6,678,196"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 126: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line two of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "or", insert "by it"; and in line four of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "persons", insert "which"; and at the end of the matter inserted by said amendment and before the period, insert: "Provided, That this section shall not be construed as having application to the preparation for publication of reports and maps resulting from authorized scientific and engineering investigations and surveys, to photography incident to the compilation and reproduction of maps and reports, or to photocopying of permanent records for preservation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 127: That the House recede from its disagreement to the

amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Sec. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government in the District of Columbia whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance and two passenger motor vehicles assigned one to the Secretary and one to the Under Secretary), unless such appropriation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the compensation of employees performing such duties."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 123, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lines four and five of the matter inserted by each amendment, strike out the words "one hundred and fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "one hundred and ten"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 131: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 4, 5, 8, 10½, 14, 24, 40, 53, 57, 61, 62, 63, 72, 75, 83, 108, 124, and 129.

MICHAEL J. KIEWAN,

W. F. NORRELL,

HENRY M. JACKSON,

FOSTER FURCOLO,

CLARENCE CANNON,

BEN F. JENSEN (except as to

amendment No. 131),

IVOR D. FENTON (except as to

amendment No. 131),

Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,

PAT MCCARRAN,

DENNIS CHAVEZ,

GUY CORDON,

KENNETH S. WHERRY,

MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Enforcement of Connally Hot Oil Act

Amendment No. 1—Expenses: Appropriates \$158,670 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$174,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Provides that not to exceed \$137,970 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Southeastern Power Administration

Amendments Nos. 3, 4, and 5—Construction: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 6—Operation and maintenance: Appropriates \$200,000, instead of \$275,000 as proposed by the House and \$125,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7—Administrative provisions: Authorizes the purchase of four automobiles, instead of five as proposed by the House and three as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8—Continuing fund: Reported in disagreement.

Construction, Southwestern Power Administration

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$3,375,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$2,564,400 as proposed by the Senate. This action provides within the total amount appropriated the sum of \$500,000 for miscellaneous construction, \$250,000 for the purchase of electric power and energy and for leasing of transmission facilities of others, and \$810,600 for continuation of construction of the facilities designated as comprising the western Missouri project.

With respect to the western Missouri project, it is expected that a determined effort will be made by the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate with the private utilities to obtain a contract that will make unnecessary the use of this appropriation for such project and that no new obligation will be incurred under authority of this appropriation for such project unless the Secretary of the Interior determines, after such negotiations, that additional facilities of such project are required to be constructed by the Government for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer.

Amendment No. 10: Provides that not to exceed \$586,800 of the construction appropriation shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10½: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 11: Strikes out the limitation upon the use of funds for construction of the western Missouri project, as proposed by the Senate.

Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$1,255,712 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,275,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13: Provides that not to exceed \$900,712 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Transfer of certain facilities, Denison Dam project

Amendment No. 14: Reported in disagreement.

Administrative provisions, Southwestern Power Administration

Amendment No. 15: Authorizes the purchase of eight automobiles as proposed by the Senate, instead of fifteen as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: Strikes out unnecessary language.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Amendment No. 17—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$20,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$14,530 as proposed by the Senate.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Construction

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$67,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$62,000,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees have agreed to defer action on the La Grande-Baker line owing to incomplete information indicating its immediate need. It is suggested that the Department make a further study and re-submit the authorization when more complete information is available.

Amendment No. 19: Provides that not to exceed \$3,387,470 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate, with the modification agreed to by the conferees that force account personal services shall not be included within this limitation.

Operation and maintenance

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$5,368,439 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,250,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21: Provides that not to exceed \$3,983,862 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Administrative provisions

Amendment No. 22: Strikes out unnecessary language.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 23—Management of lands and resources: Appropriates \$7,722,605, deletes earmarking of funds for soil and moisture conservation, and provides that not to exceed \$4,864,096 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate; instead of making an appropriation of \$6,900,000 without a limitation on personal services, as proposed by the House. This action ratifies the Senate approval of \$1,200,000 for soil and moisture conservation, even though it will not be earmarked in the bill.

Amendment No. 24—Construction: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 25: Deletes the proposal of the Senate to amend the basic law relating to the distribution of receipts from sale of timber from the reverted Oregon and California grant lands.

Amendment No. 26—Administrative provisions: Authorizes the purchase of twenty-nine automobiles, instead of thirty-two as proposed by the House and twenty-five as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Amendment No. 27—Salaries and expenses: Deletes the paragraph making one appropriation of \$65,000,000 for all of the activities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, as proposed by the Senate.

Health, education, and welfare services

Amendment No. 28: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 29: Deletes an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates \$41,824,750, instead of \$43,600,000 as proposed by the House and \$41,324,750 as proposed by the Senate. The amount approved for health, education, and welfare services includes \$400,000 to continue public assistance contributions to Indians in Arizona, and an additional \$100,000 for placement services, making a total of \$600,000 for placement services.

Amendment No. 31: Provides that not to exceed \$23,699,661 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate. In approving this limitation it is the intention of the conferees that it not be applied against the budgeted amounts for personal services of medical personnel, school teachers, and others essential to the hospital, disease preventative, and curative services and the educational assistance programs.

Resources management

Amendment No. 32: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 33: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates \$10,921,360 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$11,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35: Provides that not to exceed \$6,843,485 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Construction

Amendment No. 36: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 37: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$12,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 39: Provides that not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Reported in disagreement.

General administrative expenses

Amendment No. 41: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 42: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates \$3,300,747 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 44: Provides that not to exceed \$2,693,281 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Revolving fund for loans

Amendment No. 45: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 46: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Payment to Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians, Oklahoma

Amendment No. 47: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 48: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates \$22,655 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$25,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 50: Provides that not to exceed \$21,105 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Administrative provisions

Amendment No. 51: Authorizes the purchase of one hundred and sixty automobiles instead of one hundred and ninety-one as proposed by the House and one hundred and twenty-five as proposed by the Senate.

Tribal funds

Amendment No. 52: Makes a grammatical change.

Amendment No. 53: Reported in disagreement.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

General investigations

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates \$4,500,000, instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,600,000 as proposed by the Senate. This action ratifies the action of the Senate in approving \$100,000 for investigations of the Colbran project, Colorado.

Amendment No. 55: Provides that not to exceed \$4,234,553 shall be available for personal services, instead of \$3,163,396 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56: Provides that \$3,810,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund, instead of \$3,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,903,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Construction and rehabilitation

Amendment No. 57: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 58: Appropriates \$202,767,725, instead of \$197,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$208,535,450 as proposed by the Senate. The allotment of the appropriation to the projects covered by the budget estimates is left to the administrative determination of the Secretary of the Interior with the understanding that funds will not be allocated in excess of the respective sums indicates in column four of the project breakdown appearing at pages 15 and 16 of Senate report No. 499, and that there will be no allocation of current year or prior appropriations for any project item not heretofore appropriated for or included in the fiscal 1952 program presented to Congress or for any project item eliminated by the action of the House, the Senate, or both, upon the budget estimates, with the following exceptions. The managers on the part of both Houses agree that of the 1952 appropriation \$191,000 is to be available for operation and maintenance of the All-American Canal, as provided for in the Senate report, that \$500,000 is to be available for the initiation of construction of a single circuit 230-kilovolt transmission line, for other than customer service, from Folsom Dam power plant to interconnect at the nearest feasible point with the east side Shasta-Tracy transmission line; that the Secretary should make available from unobligated balances of prior appropriations approximately \$1,463,000 for emergency work on the Middle Rio Grande project, New

Mexico; and that the proposed allocation of an additional \$185,000 to the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, is not approved.

It is to be understood that this action by the conferees expressly denies any appropriation for the following transmission facilities.

Central Valley project, California

	Amount of 1952 estimate
Keswick-Tracy via Elverta 115-kilovolt line.....	\$1,400,000
Port Chicago-Mare Island 115-kilovolt line and 2 substations.....	300,000
Tracy-Patterson-Naval Supply 69-kilovolt line and 2 substations.....	450,000
CVP-BPA interconnection and substation, 230-kilovolt, including \$400,000 contained in S. Doc. 39.....	2,100,000
Tracy-Livermore-Ames Laboratory line and substation.....	700,000
Tracy-Contrera Costa-Clayton-Ygnacio 69-kilovolt line and 2 substations.....	201,170
Keswick-Shasta Dam area PUD 115-kilovolt line and substation.....	105,303
Elverta-Sacramento switchyard..	150,000

Total 1952 estimate disallowed..... \$5,406,478

Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado

The \$100,000 included in the 1952 Budget estimates for the Estes-Leyner 115-kilovolt transmission line has been disallowed, but, for the Estes power plant-Pole Hill power plant 115-kilovolt line \$100,000 has been approved for the 1952 program.

Minidoka project, American Falls power division, Idaho

	Amount of 1952 estimate
American Falls power plant....	\$1,067,000
American Falls switchyard.....	133,000
Transmission line (American Falls-Minidoka Dam)	100,000

Total 1952 estimate disallowed..... \$1,300,000

Transmission division, Missouri River Basin

	Amount of 1952 estimate
Canyon Ferry-Great Falls 115-kilovolt line and substation....	\$753,450
Canyon Ferry-Three Forks-Anaconda 115-kilovolt lines and substations.....	703,000
Miles City-Yellowtail 115-kilovolt lines and substations.....	85,000
Yellowtail-Billings 115-kilovolt lines and substations.....	810,000
Sioux City-Omaha line.....	207,463
Omaha substation.....	70,242
Sioux City-Storm Lake line....	118,428
Storm Lake - Denison - Holland-Omaha line.....	30,624
Sioux City-Sibley line.....	467,643
Additional reduction.....	500,490

Total 1952 estimate disallowed..... \$3,746,340

The managers on the part of both Houses strongly reaffirm the language contained in the House Committee Report accompanying H. R. 3790 with reference to prohibiting the proposed inter-connection of the Central Valley Power system and the Bonneville Power system. Reports have been received that work on the proposed inter-tie has continued despite the categorical denial in the reports issued by the Appropriations Committees of both the House and the Senate this year and approved by both Houses of Congress, and a similar categorical injunction

last year approved by both Houses of Congress denying the use of funds for this purpose.

The Conferees hereby request the Secretary of the Interior to submit immediately a full and complete report including disciplinary action taken by him in this case.

Amendment No. 59: Provides that not to exceed \$38,104,672 shall be available for personal services, instead of \$29,160,408 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 60: Provides that \$28,972,650 shall be derived from the reclamation fund as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$29,202,200 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 61: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 62: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 63: Reported in disagreement.

Operation and maintenance

Amendment No. 64: Appropriates \$15,977,594 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$15,094,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 65: Strikes out unnecessary words.

Amendment No. 66: Provides that \$12,476,494 shall be derived from the reclamation fund as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$12,592,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 67: Strikes out unnecessary words.

Amendment No. 68: Provides that not to exceed \$10,698,514 shall be available for personal services, instead of \$10,331,434 as proposed by the Senate.

General administrative expenses

Amendment No. 69: Appropriates \$5,478,203 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 70: Provides that not to exceed \$4,696,178 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Emergency fund

Amendment No. 71: Appropriates \$400,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$500,000 as proposed by the House.

Transfer of facilities, Fort Peck project, Montana

Amendment No. 72: Reported in disagreement.

Administrative provisions

Amendment No. 73: Authorizes not to exceed \$50,000 for consultant services as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$30,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 74: Increases to \$100 per day the amount that can be paid for consultant services as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$50 per day as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 75: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 76 and 77: Strike out limitation inserted by the House, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, and 83—Coachella Distribution System: Authorize expenditures of not to exceed \$2,783,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of not to exceed \$1,684,000 as proposed by the House, for completion of construction of the Coachella division of the All-American Canal system; make the expenditure of such funds mandatory as proposed by the Senate, instead of permissive as proposed by the House; and instead of requiring a definite repayment arrangement in advance of expenditure as proposed by the House, adopt the proposal of the Senate that such expenditure shall be repayable unless it shall be judicially determined by a court of competent jurisdiction that the irrigation district is not liable therefor. Amendment No. 83 is reported in disagreement.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Amendment No. 84: Appropriates \$21,300,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$21,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 85: Provides that not to exceed \$13,455,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF MINES

Conservation and development of mineral resources

Amendment No. 86: Appropriates \$16,858,603 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$17,950,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees have approved \$356,000 for control of fires in inactive coal deposits, such sum to be absorbed from the total appropriation approved for the conservation and development of mineral resources. The entire amount of the budget estimate for engineering and other research on the development and production of petroleum and natural gas has been approved by the conferees. No reduction is to be made in the sums to be available for personal services with respect to the two afore-mentioned activities: \$91,775 is to be available for personal services at the Laramie Station and \$545,572 is to be available for personal services at the Bartlettville Station.

Amendment No. 87: Provides that not to exceed \$10,446,575 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Construction

Amendment No. 88: Appropriates \$1,587,412 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,250,000 as proposed by the House. This action includes approval of \$350,000 for completion of the pilot plant started during World War II at Laramie, Wyoming, for research by the Bureau of Mines on the production of alumina from low-grade ores. The ores to be experimented with are different from bauxite ores found in other areas of the country. In approving this appropriation it is the intent of the conferees that, even though the experimental operations will not be financed from this appropriation, no research shall be conducted at this station on processes or methods whether patented or not unless all royalty and other beneficial rights to developments or discoveries from such research accrue exclusively to the Government.

Amendment No. 89: Provides that not to exceed \$113,287 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

General administrative expenses

Amendment No. 90: Appropriates \$1,176,841 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,290,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 91: Provides that not to exceed \$1,018,434 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Management and protection

Amendment No. 92: Provides that not to exceed \$6,584,342 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities

Amendment No. 93: Appropriates \$7,369,790 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$7,300,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 94: Provides that not to exceed \$4,193,747 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Construction

Amendment No. 95: Appropriates \$11,370,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$11,975,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 96: Provides that not to exceed \$945,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

General administrative expenses

Amendment No. 97: Appropriates \$1,171,774 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,284,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 98: Provides that not to exceed \$1,014,538 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Management of resources

Amendment No. 99: Appropriates \$6,678,196, instead of \$6,870,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,606,558 as proposed by the Senate. This action restores the amount of \$263,442 contained in the budget estimate for river basin studies except that the entire sum appropriated is to be subject to the reduction in funds to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 100: Provides that not to exceed \$4,259,363 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Investigations of resources

Amendment No. 101: Appropriates \$3,858,986 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,875,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 102: Provides that not to exceed \$2,487,629 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 103: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to prevent the use of this appropriation for investigations, surveys, and similar work in foreign countries.

Construction

Amendment No. 104: Appropriates \$733,742 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$750,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 105: Provides that not to exceed \$146,324 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

General administrative expenses

Amendment No. 106: Appropriates \$806,631 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$882,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 107: Provides that not to exceed \$678,319 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

Amendment No. 108—Administration of Territories: Reported in disagreement.

Alaska public works

Amendment No. 109: Appropriates \$7,000,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$8,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 110: Provides that not to exceed \$463,000 shall be available for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$500,000 for this purpose as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 111: Provides that not to exceed \$333,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Construction of roads, Alaska

Amendment No. 112: Provides that not to exceed \$2,493,000 shall be available for personal services, as provided by the Senate.

Operation and maintenance of roads, Alaska

Amendment No. 113: Appropriates \$2,900,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 114: Provides that not to exceed \$1,935,840 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Administrative provisions (Alaska Road Commission)

Amendment No. 115: Provides that not to exceed 20 percent of the construction appropriation be available for force account work as proposed by the Senate, instead of not to exceed 25 percent as proposed by the House.

Virgin Islands public works

Amendment No. 116: Appropriates \$992,970 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 117: Provides that not to exceed \$63,270 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 118: Inserts a proviso that no part of the appropriation shall be used for waterfront development work on St.

Thomas and provides that the amount included in the 1952 budget estimates for such work be made available for school and hospital facilities, as proposed by the Senate.

Administration, Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 119: Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary: Appropriates \$2,154,911 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 120: Provides that not to exceed \$1,890,798 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Rescission of unused contract authority

Amendment No. 121: Strikes out the word "unused" and in lieu thereof inserts the word "unobligated", as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 122: Changes the effective date of the rescission from June 30, 1951, as proposed by the House, to June 30, 1952, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 123: Adopts the Senate proposal to strike out the words "except public works in the Virgin Islands."

Transfers of property—Office of Territories

Amendment No. 124: Reported in disagreement.

Virgin Islands Corporation

Amendment No. 125: Appropriates \$2,595,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,800,000 as proposed by the House.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Expenditures for informational and propaganda purposes

Amendment No. 126: Strikes out the proposal of the House for limiting the use of funds for propaganda purposes, and adopts the proposal of the Senate to impose limitations upon expenditures for such purposes; but modifies the Senate proposal by adding at the end thereof a provision that the limitation shall not apply to the publication of reports and maps resulting from authorized scientific and engineering investigations and surveys or to photography incident to the compilation and reproduction of maps and reports or to photocopying of permanent records for preservation.

Limitation on employment of chauffeurs

Amendment No. 127: Adopts the amendment of the Senate limiting the employment of chauffeurs of Government-owned cars but restricts its operation to the District of Columbia and excepts the automobile assigned to the Secretary and that assigned to the Under Secretary.

Employees engaged in personnel work

Amendment No. 128: Adopts the amendment of the Senate limiting the number of persons to be engaged in personnel work, but changes the proposed ratio of one such employee to one hundred and fifteen employees to one such employee to one hundred and ten employees.

Antistrike provision

Amendment No. 129: Reported in disagreement.

Expenditures during final quarter of fiscal year

Amendment No. 130: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to limit the expenditures for certain purposes during the last quarter of the fiscal year to not to exceed the average quarterly amount of such expenditures during the preceding three quarters of the fiscal year, except where the Director of the Bureau of the Budget authorizes otherwise. It is the intention of the conferees that excessive last-quarter purchases be prevented so that accumulated last quarter balances revert to the Treasury.

Limitation on filling vacancies

Amendment No. 131: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the Jensen amendment which was inserted by the House and also strikes out the proposal of the Senate to

add a provision which would enumerate reductions already made in the various paragraphs throughout the bill as a substitute for the Jensen amendment. The conferees have agreed to amendments to the House bill which have the total effect of reducing the sums available for personal services by \$13,841,606 below the amount requested in the Budget for 1952 for such purposes.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
FOSTER FURCOLO,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN (except as to
amendment No. 131),
IVOR D. FENTON, (except as to
amendment No. 131),
Managers on the Part of the House.

TEMPORARY APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1952

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Joint Resolution 302, amending an act making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That clause (c) of section 4 of the joint resolution of July 1, 1951 (Public Law 70), is hereby amended by striking out "July 31, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "August 31, 1951."

SEC. 2. The amounts appropriated by subsection (e) of section 1 of such joint resolution for international development and economic cooperation are hereby increased by such amounts as may be necessary to permit such activities to continue under such joint resolution at monthly rates not in excess of those permitted by the amounts appropriated therefor for the month of July 1951.

SEC. 3. Subsection (e) of section 1 of such joint resolution is amended by inserting, following "Institute of Inter-American Affairs;" the following: "Aid to Palestine refugees (not to exceed \$2,000,000);".

SEC. 4. Section 3 of such joint resolution is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "Provided, That appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to any other act making appropriations for the fiscal year 1952 shall remain subject to the provisions of this section until enactment into law of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that this continuing resolution, as now proposed, contemplates an extension up to and including August 31, 1951.

Mr. CANNON. That is correct. It extends the current resolution 31 days.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Further reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that, for one, I do not like these continuing resolutions. I do not think it is in the national interest to operate under this form of resolution, particularly when it involves appropriations not otherwise authorized by law.

The delay in respect to appropriations at this session of Congress has exceeded anything I can recall in all my experience here. It is without precedent.

I am glad the resolution limits the extension to 30 days. I hope appropriation bills now pending will be cleaned up within that period, and that we will not again be confronted with any such situation as confronts us today and as confronted us 30 days ago.

Mr. CANNON. A year ago under the 1-package bill, all the regular supply bills were reported to the House in March and passed the House and were sent to the Senate early in May. If again reported in a 1-package bill next year, we will pass them and send them to the Senate before the Easter holidays. And we will know how much we are spending when we pass them and be in a position to economize accordingly. And the Ways and Means Committee will not have to wait indefinitely to draft a tax bill to provide the money.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does this resolution contain the same provisions, with the exception of the date, as were contained in the previous resolution which was finally agreed upon after conference with the Senate? What changes are there, if any?

Mr. CANNON. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], it continues the present resolution as is. There is no change.

It is the current joint resolution verbatim with the exception that we have included in response to a letter from the President, \$2,000,000 for Arab relief.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is a new item? Was that appropriation item authorized by any act of Congress?

Mr. CANNON. No, no; there is no legislative authorization.

During the course of the Palestine hostilities in 1948, approximately one million citizens of the Palestine mandate fled from their homes and took refuge outside of the boundaries of the present State of Israel. Most of these were Arabs, the total including both Christian and Moslem elements of the population. For the past two and one-half years, these refugees have been supported by the United Nations, first, through the United Nations Relief for Palestine Refugees, and beginning May 1, 1950, by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. As of April 15, 1951, a total of \$78,977,777 has been contributed to the funds of these agencies, \$40,450,000 of this total by the United States. Major contributions to the Agency since that date have been \$3,000,000 from the United States, \$700,000 from Canada, and \$850,000 from France.

The operations of the Agency have centered on relief which has cost approximately \$2 per refugee per month. At the present time, projects for resettlement of a substantial number of the refugees in neighboring Arab countries appear reasonably bright.

At the moment, there is no other resource available to the refugees except United Nations aid.

The refugees represent the single greatest obstacle to peace between Israel on the one hand the Arab States on the other. Their numbers are large in

proportion to the settled population of their states which have given them asylum. Unless relief needs are met, the refugees might well be the cause of grave disturbance, if not war, in the Near East.

Tensions in the area are high. Its importance has been stressed in the testimony of the Department of Defense and the Department of State in current hearings on the mutual security program.

The Agency's uncommitted funds were exhausted as of July 1, and supplies in the feeding pipeline amounted to only 21 days. Since that time, a contribution from the United Kingdom and a borrowing from the United Nations Working Capital Fund have enabled operations to continue during the month of July. Further funds are urgently required, however, to prevent a collapse of the program, and in response to a letter from the President we have included in the joint resolution an appropriation of \$2,000,000 for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, if no one else desires to be heard, I move the previous question on the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House joint resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks pertaining to this continuing resolution at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection on to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the termination date originally written into this continuing resolution was September 31 next, which was objected to by the minority members of the Appropriations Committee as being too long a period of time to allow all the department and agencies of Government to spend huge sums of money without regard to the specific savings written into the appropriation bills which have already been adopted in one or both the Houses of Congress for fiscal year 1952, such saving for example as are provided in the Jensen amendments. Consequently, the minority members of the committee served notice that unless the termination date of August 31 next was agreed to, the following amendment would be introduced on the floor of the House, even though it had been defeated in the full committee this morning by voice vote.

I am pleased, however, that the termination date of August 31 has now been agreed to, and I sincerely hope that a third continuing resolution will not be necessary. Such delays and dilly-dallying cannot be justified by any stretch of the imagination. I am sure my proposed amendment would have been adopted by the House had not the agreement already been reached to terminate the continuing resolution on August 31 instead of September 31, which makes it unnecessary to offer my amendment to this continuing resolution.

Proposed Jensen amendment in continuing resolution: "Provided, That after August 31, 1951, the provisions of this continuing resolution shall apply only to those agencies or departments of Government which have been specifically exempted by the Jensen amendments previously adopted by the House of Representatives to the several appropriations bills for fiscal year 1952, and to the uniformed personnel in all branches of our defense establishments."

Note: The Jensen amendment was not offered to the District of Columbia appropriation bill due to the fact that most of the funds provided in that bill will be expended for schools, hospitals, and park improvements, law enforcement officers, firemen, school teachers, and hospital personnel. Also, due to the fact that the taxpayers of the District of Columbia pay the greater part of the bill.

The Jensen amendment was not offered to the legislative appropriation bill in which funds were provided for the Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, the Capitol Police force, and for the House of Representatives. The records show that over the past 20 years these branches of Government have increased their personnel less than twofold, while the average of most of those departments or agencies of Government which have not been exempted by the Jensen amendment have increased their personnel by an average of almost fivefold.

The Post Office and Civil Service appropriations bill was the first to reach the floor of the House of Representatives. The Jensen amendment was not offered to that bill due to the fact that it had not yet been fully decided at that early date as to the percentage of vacancies that should properly be permitted to be filled.

With these exceptions the Jensen amendment has been adopted to all other appropriation bills for fiscal year 1952 considered by the House of Representatives to date.

The armed services appropriation bill and the foreign military and economic aid appropriation bill are the only regular appropriation bills not yet acted upon by the House of Representatives. We propose to apply the Jensen amendment to the civilian personnel in those bills.

In brief, this amendment to this continuing resolution will not apply to the uniformed personnel of any branch of our defense establishments, nor to the law-enforcement personnel in any department or agency of Government, nor to the atomic-energy personnel, nor to the doctors, nurses, and other personnel in veterans' or other Government hospitals, who administer to the sick and disabled, nor to the personnel in such other agencies and departments of Government which have been specifically exempted under the provisions of the Jensen amendments adopted by the House of Representatives to the appropriations bills for fiscal year 1952.

The Jensen amendment has been adopted by the House of Representatives to the following appropriation bills: Labor-Federal Security, independent offices, Interior, Agriculture, State-

Justice and Commerce, and civil functions.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the House joint resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT OF BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy and ask unanimous consent that the report of the Board be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY, 1951, KINGS POINT, LONG ISLAND, N. Y., MAY 11-12, 1951

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

GENTLEMEN: Pursuant to Public Law 301, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 11, 1944, the following Senators and Members of the House of Representatives were designated to constitute the 1951 Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy:

By the President of the Senate: Senator LESTER C. HUNT, Democrat, Wyoming.

By the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Democrat, Colorado, ex-officio; Senator JAMES P. KEM, Republican, Missouri; Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, Washington.

By the Speaker of the House: Representative CHARLES P. NELSON, Republican, Maine; Representative EUGENE J. KEOGH, Democrat, New York.

By the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee: Representative EDWARD J. HART, Democrat, New Jersey, ex-officio; Representative DONALD L. O'TOOLE, Democrat, New York; Representative ALVIN F. WEICHEL, Republican, Ohio; Representative WILLIAM A. BARRETT, Democrat, Pennsylvania.

The meetings of the Eighth Congressional Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy took place on the 11th of May 1951.

Congressman ALVIN F. WEICHEL, Ohio, and Congressman CHARLES P. NELSON, Maine, were accompanied from Washington, D. C., to Kings Point, by Rear Adm. Telfair Knight, United States Maritime Service, Chief, Office of Maritime Training, and Commandant, United States Maritime Service; Capt. John T. Everett, United States Maritime Service, supervisor, United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps; and by Commander Calvin R. Shorter, chief liaison officer, Office of Maritime Training.

The Board assembled at Wiley Hall, Kings Point at 10:30, Friday, May 11, 1951, where they were welcomed by the Superintendent of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, Rear Adm. Gordon McLintock and his staff.

The following members of the Board were present: Congressman EUGENE J. KEOGH, New York; Congressman ALVIN F. WEICHEL, Ohio; Congressman CHARLES P. NELSON, Maine.

FIRST MEETING OF THE BOARD

The Eighth Congressional Board of Visitors convened in the conference room in Wiley Hall under the temporary chairmanship of Congressman ALVIN F. WEICHEL, Ohio, at 10:30.

The Board elected Congressman ALVIN F. WEICHEL, Ohio, to serve as permanent chairman and confirmed the appointments of Commander Clifford W. Sandberg and Lt. John A. Walsh, United States Maritime Service, as secretary and assistant secretary, respectively.

The secretary discussed with the chairman and Members of the Board the proposed agenda for the meetings. Upon the conclusion of these discussions the chairman then directed the secretary to invite the Chief, Office of Maritime Training and the Superintendent of the United States Merchant Marine Academy and their respective staffs to join the Board in conference.

At the request of the chairman, the Superintendent read his annual report to the Board. After the reading of the Superintendent's report, the chairman and the members of the Board questioned the Chief, Office of Maritime Training and the Superintendent, and their respective staffs, concerning the needs of the Academy. The matters brought under discussion are contained in this report under the section devoted to general comments and specific recommendations.

At the conclusion of the first meeting the Cadet-Midshipman Regimental Commander Lee W. Stanton was presented to the chairman and the members of the Board and extended an invitation to the members of the Board to lunch with the regiment in Delano Hall. Recess was taken at 12 o'clock.

MEETING WITH THE REGIMENT OF CADET-MIDSHIPMEN

At luncheon, Congressman ALVIN F. WEICHEL, Ohio, addressed the regiment of cadet-midshipmen briefly, at the conclusion of the meal.

Cadet-midshipmen from the districts and States represented by members of the Board were thereupon presented to the Board members. Private conferences were carried on in the cadet-midshipmen lounge from 12:45 to 1:30.

At the conclusion of interviews with constituent cadet-midshipmen, the members of the Board met in the conference room, Wiley Hall, with the cadet-midshipman regimental commander and his staff. Private conversations with these cadet-midshipman leaders were held from 1:45 until 2:30. The members of the Board were most impressed with the mature and obvious sincerity of these young men during this interchange of thoughts and ideas.

SECOND MEETING OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS

The Board sat in executive session with the secretary and the assistant secretary. At this meeting the chairman instructed the secretary as to those items which were to appear in the report of the Eighth Congressional Board of Visitors. During part of this meeting the chairman invited Rear Adm. Telfair Knight, United States Maritime Service, Chief, Office of Maritime Training and Commandant, United States Maritime Service, and the Superintendent; and the supervisor of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, into the meeting for additional clarifying information. The results of these deliberations appear in this report under general comments and specific recommendations.

GENERAL COMMENTS

The Board was gratified with the admirable esprit de corps that exists in the regiment and among the officers and personnel of the Academy. The Board was also greatly impressed with the obvious and important contribution made by Kings Point to the national defense structure of the Nation. The Board strongly feels all those who have had a part in making Kings Point what it is today deserve the grateful thanks of the entire Nation. In particular, the Board wishes to specifically commend the Chief, Office of Maritime Training, the supervisor of the

Mr. Speaker, as much as we love him, not one of us who knows Ed Gossett's reasons for his resignation would have him return. He is entering into a place of even higher responsibilities than he has borne here, for he is carrying his experiences as a legislator back to the people as an enlightened private citizen. In such a capacity he may, and I am sure he will, increase his stature as a citizen of America.

Joining with all these others of his friends who have spoken here about him, I wish for Ed and Mary Helen, and all Gossett children a fond godspeed.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, Ed Gossett leaves this body today. We will miss him personally and we will miss his very great ability, his tireless energy, his clear-thinking approach to all problems.

He leaves a warm spot in the hearts of each of us. There is a closeness in the Texas delegation which heretofore I have found only in the Army in combat. Any vacancy saddens all of us.

Ed Gossett brought honor, dignity, and respect to our State, our delegation, and this body.

As he leaves, we wish for him and for his lovely family great happiness and contentment.

A record of honorable and able service in the House of Representatives is one of great distinction. As he leaves Congress today, Ed Gossett holds such a record.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with others in saying something about Representative Ed Gossett who is leaving this body.

He is a great American, a conscientious and courageous legislator and he will be greatly missed in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Gossett is indeed a pillar of the Republic. His service here has been an unselfish and patriotic service. I know that he leaves us carrying the good wishes of every Member of this body.

I personally wish to extend to him and to his fine family my best wishes for a very fine future in every respect.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, my dear friend, Ed Gossett, is today completing an outstanding term of outstanding service. Ed came here of his own volition, to serve his State and Nation. He served well and honorably. He leaves of his own volition, with the satisfaction of a big job well done.

He and his family return to their neighbors, and their friends, in Texas. We are the poorer because of his loss, but I feel a degree of satisfaction in the knowledge that Ed and his family will be in the surroundings they so properly love. Our best wishes to you, Ed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep personal regret that I learned that our colleague, Ed Gossett, of Texas, was resigning from the House of Representatives.

I have served with him in the years that he has been in Congress, and I feel that his resignation from the House is a great loss both to the State of Texas and to the Nation.

I regard him as one of the soundest statesmen and most profound lawyers

that I have served with during my years in the House.

While he has always been conservative, he has always been fair and he has always been tolerant of the views of those who disagreed with him.

His pleasant and affable conduct toward his colleagues in all circumstances have made him beloved by all who have served with him.

While I feel a deep personal sense of loss at his leaving the House, I wish him well-deserved success and happiness in the new field which he is about to enter.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this is a very unhappy day for me—the day that the House takes official notice of the retirement from Congress of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gossett]. Ed Gossett and I have been associated together in many ways and upon many occasions through the years and I regret very much to see our paths separate. I think perhaps I have known Mr. Gossett longer than any other Member of the House. He and I were students together in the early twenties at the University of Texas. We participated together in student activities there and on one occasion, memorable to us at the time, we tied for first place, along with some other student whose name I no longer remember, in a contest designed to select the best extemporaneous speaker in the university. Not much came of the contest and the oilman who had offered the prize money went broke and we did not collect the funds which we had so devoutly sought. However, our friendship has endured and brought dividends of pleasure through the years.

When we had finished our formal schooling at the university, Mr. Gossett and I entered the practice of law and he became district attorney in one part of west Texas and I became district attorney in another area of west Texas. We were students together, we were district attorneys at about the same time, and we have served in Congress together since January 1939.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of keen personal loss that I mark the departure from Congress of my old-time friend, Ed Gossett. Moreover, there are other ties which bind us together. Mr. Gossett's mother is a citizen of Post, Tex., within the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, and members of the Gossett family live in the general area. The Gossetts are the right kind of people. They are real Texans and real Americans. The characteristics which have been exemplified here by Congressman Gossett are typical of the sturdy Americanism of the Gossett clan.

At a special luncheon given by the Texas delegation honoring Mr. Gossett last week many of us took advantage of the opportunity to pay tribute to him and express regret over his departure from Congress. Upon that occasion, however, our choice words were reserved for Mrs. Gossett and the five Gossett children. Mrs. Gossett and the children were not present, but they received the plaudits of the assembled delegation.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to miss Ed Gossett and his lovely family. But,

really, this is no time for good-bys. After all, geographical location is not as significant as it once was, and we shall claim the privilege of seeing the Gossetts whenever possible at their new home in Dallas, Tex., and we shall exercise the happy privilege of remembering them always as friends worth having.

So, to you, Ed, may I say, good luck and God bless you and your family. You have written a record in public life of which you and your family can always be proud. As you have sought in every possible way to promote the American way of life here, everybody who knows Ed Gossett knows that when you return to the State of Texas you will carry on the good work.

Mr. HUBERT. Mr. Speaker, the State of Louisiana and its people today lose a friend in Congress, a dear and close friend, in the resignation of Ed Gossett.

Ed Gossett's place in the hearts of Louisianians comes not only from the closeness of the great State of Texas but from the things which Ed Gossett and the people of Louisiana have in common.

The great majority of our people in Louisiana believe in the things Ed Gossett believes and thinks like Ed Gossett thinks.

We both hold sacred the high principles which motivated the founding fathers of this country when they wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. We both have consistently refused to accept any other philosophy of government other than that upon which this Nation was built.

We still stand fast in defense of those same principles and those of us who remain after Ed Gossett has gone pledge to him our determination to carry on the fight where he left off and to hold aloft the lighted torch of individual freedom and private enterprise.

It is fitting and proper that Louisiana's Representatives in the Congress should join in paying tribute to Ed Gossett because it was only yesterday that he stood in the front ranks fighting with every weapon at his command to preserve and protect property rights which the people of Louisiana held sacred to themselves. Obviously I mean his fight in the interest of the so-called tidelands bill. I feel we could not have achieved the victory which we did without the undying courage and tenacity of Ed Gossett.

It was not yesterday that he began the fight. It was years ago but it was yesterday that he saw his banner planted on the ramparts of victory and as long as we carry on in the spirit of Ed Gossett it will wave there.

In the name of the people of Louisiana I say to Ed Gossett, "Thank you for a job done and done well."

In my own name I wish Ed Gossett success in his new field. He goes with the best wishes and heartfelt admiration of his colleagues. What more could any man desire from those with whom he has served so long.

In Ed Gossett is exemplified the finest type of representation under our Ameri-

can system of government. It has been a privilege to know him. I wish him Godspeed.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, in the daily issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for Thursday, July 26, at page 9128, column 3, line 19, I am recorded as saying "the suspicion of influence or obligation should fall," and so forth. This should read "should not fall." The omission of the word "not" makes a slight difference. I would like to have the RECORD corrected.

Again, on page 9129, third column, in the fine print, the amendment printed there is not the one actually under debate. The wording used by the reporter is of the amendment for which a second amendment was substituted, after the first was ruled out on a point of order. To correct the RECORD, the words "Title I of" should be struck out, and also the last three lines of the fine print. The comma after the word "representation" should then be changed to a period.

I ask unanimous consent that these corrections may be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Reserves Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services be permitted to sit during general debate today during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 142]		
Baring	Hall.	Price
Bates, Mass.	Edwin Arthur	Rabaut
Blatnik	Hall,	Redden
Bosone	Leonard W.	Regan
Breen	Irving	Rogers, Colo.
Brehm	Jackson, Calif.	Saylor
Busbey	Javits	Scott, Hardie
Byrne, N. Y.	Kennedy	Scott,
Camp	Kersten, Wis.	Hugh D., Jr.
Case	Kilburn	Shelley
Celler	Kilday	Short
Chatham	King	Sikes
Chenoweth	McDonough	Smith, Kans.
Coudert	Machrowicz	Smith, Va.
Davis, Tenn.	Mack, Ill.	Spence
Dawson	Morgan	Staggers
Dingell	Morton	Stockman
Durham	Moulder	Taber
Eberhart	Murdock	Thomas
Ellsworth	Murray, Tenn.	Velde
Elston	Murray, Wis.	Vinson
Engle	O'Neill	Vursell
Fisher	Perkins	Watts
Gamble	Pickett	Werdel
Gillette	Poulson	Whitaker
Golden	Powell	Yates

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 352 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the Part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 30, 1951.)

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, this report is the best we have been able to work out with the Senate. I trust that the recommendations of the committee will be accepted. That is the only statement I care to make, Mr. Speaker, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. JENSEN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JENSEN moves to recommit the conference report on H. R. 3790 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on disagreement to Senate amendment No. 131.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska) there were—ayes 51, noes 64.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 189, nays 170, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

YEAS—189

Aandahl	Abernethy	Allen, Calif.
Abbitt	Adair	Allen, Ill.

Andersen,	Fulton	Morano
H. Carl	Gathings	Mumma
Anderson, Calif.	Gavin	Nelson
Andresen,	George	Nicholson
August H.	Goodwin	Norblad
Andrews	Graham	O'Hara
Angell	Gross	Ostertag
Arends	Gwinn	Patterson
Auchincloss	Hagen	Phillips
Ayres	Hale	Potter
Baker	Hall,	Prouty
Bakewell	Leonard W.	Radwan
Beall	Halleck	Reece, Tenn.
Beamer	Hand	Reed, Ill.
Belcher	Harden	Reed, N. Y.
Bender	Harrison, Va.	Rees, Kans.
Bennett, Mich.	Harrison, Wyo.	Riehlman
Berry	Harvey	Robeson
Betts	Herlong	Rogers, Mass.
Bishop	Herter	Rogers, Tex.
Blackney	Heseltun	Sadiak
Boggs, Del.	Hess	St. George
Bolton	Hill	Schwabe
Bow	Hillings	Scrivner
Bramblett	Hinshaw	Scudder
Bray	Hoeven	Seely-Brown
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman, Ill.	Shafer
Brownson	Hoffman, Mich.	Simpson, Ill.
Budge	Holmes	Simpson, Pa.
Buffett	Hope	Sittler
Burdick	Horan	Smith, Va.
Burton	Jackson, Calif.	Smith, Wis.
Bush	James	Springer
Butler	Jarman	Stanley
Byrnes, Wis.	Jenison	Stefan
Canfield	Jenkins	Talle
Chipperfield	Jensen	Taylor
Church	Johnson	Thompson,
Clevenger	Jonas	Mich.
Cole, Kans.	Jones,	Tollefson
Cole, N. Y.	Woodrow W.	Towe
Corbett	Judd	Vail
Cotton	Kearney	Van Pelt
Crawford	Kearney	Van Zandt
Crumpacker	Kearns	Vaughn
Cunningham	Keating	Vorys
Curtis, Mo.	Latham	Vursell
Curtis, Nebr.	LeCompte	Weichel
Dague	Love	Werdel
Davis, Ga.	Lucas	Wharton
Davis, Wis.	McConnell	Wheeler
Denny	McCulloch	Widnall
Devereux	McGregor	Wigglesworth
D'Ewart	McMillan	Williams, Miss.
Dolliver	McVey	Williams, N. Y.
Dondero	Mack, Wash.	Wilson, Ind.
Doughton	Martin, Iowa	Wilson, Tex.
Fallon	Martin, Mass.	Winstead
Fellows	Mason	Wolcott
Fenton	Merrrow	Wolverton
Ford	Miller, Md.	Wood, Idaho
Forrester	Miller, Nebr.	Woodruff
Fugate	Miller, N. Y.	

NAYS—170

Addonizio	Dempsey	Hull
Albert	Denton	Jackson, Wash.
Allen, La.	Donohue	Jones, Ala.
Anfuso	Donovan	Jones, Mo.
Aspinall	Dorn	Jones,
Bailey	Doyle	Hamilton C.
Barden	Elliott	Karsten, Mo.
Barrett	Evins	Kee
Bates, Ky.	Feighan	Kelley, Pa.
Battle	Fernandez	Kelly, N. Y.
Beckworth	Fine	Keogh
Bennett, Fla.	Flood	Kerr
Bentsen	Fogarty	King
Boggs, La.	Forand	Kirwan
Bolling	Frazier	Klein
Bonner	Furcolo	Kluczynski
Boykin	Garmatz	Lane
Brooks	Gary	Lanham
Brown, Ga.	Gordon	Lantaff
Bryson	Gore	Larcade
Burleson	Granahan	Lesinski
Burnside	Granger	Lind
Cannon	Grant	Lyle
Carlyle	Green	McCarthy
Carnahan	Greenwood	McCormack
Celler	Gregory	McGrath
Chelf	Hardy	McGuire
Chudoff	Harris	McKinnon
Clemente	Hart	McMullen
Colmer	Havener	Madden
Combs	Hays, Ark.	Magee
Cooley	Hays, Ohio	Mahon
Cooper	Hébert	Mansfield
Cox	Hedrick	Marshall
Crosser	Heffernan	Miller, Calif.
Deane	Heller	Mills
DeGraffenried	Holifield	Mitchell
Delaney	Howell	Morris

Morrison	Rankin	Staggers
Multer	Reams	Steed
Murphy	Rhodes	Stigler
Norrel	Ribicoff	Stockman
O'Brien, Ill.	Richards	Sutton
O'Brien, Mich.	Riley	Tackett
O'Konski	Rivers	Thompson, Tex.
O'Toole	Roberts	Thornberry
Passman	Rodino	Trimble
Patman	Rogers, Fla.	Walter
Patten	Rooney	Welch
Philbin	Roosevelt	Whitten
Poage	Sabath	Wickersham
Polk	Sasser	Wier
Preston	Secret	Willis
Priest	Shelley	Withrow
Quinn	Sheppard	Yates
Rains	Sleminski	Yorty
Ramsay	Smith, Miss.	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—74

Armstrong	Gamble	Poulson
Baring	Gillette	Powell
Bates, Mass.	Golden	Price
Blatnik	Gossett	Rabaut
Bosone	Hall	Redden
Breen	Edwin Arthur	Regan
Brehm	Hunter	Rogers, Colo.
Buckley	Irving	Saylor
Busbey	Javits	Scott, Hardie
Byrne, N. Y.	Kennedy	Scott,
Camp	Kersten, Wis.	Hugh D., Jr.
Case	Kilburn	Sheehan
Chatham	Kilday	Short
Chenoweth	McDonough	Sikes
Coudert	Machrowicz	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Tenn.	Mack, Ill.	Spence
Dawson	Meador	Taber
Dingell	Morgan	Teague
Dollinger	Morton	Thomas
Durham	Moulder	Velde
Eaton	Murdock	Vinson
Eberharter	Murray, Tenn.	Watts
Ellsworth	Murray, Wis.	Whitaker
Elston	O'Neill	Wood, Ga.
Engle	Perkins	
Fisher	Pickett	

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mrs. Bosone against.

Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Morgan against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Machrowicz against.

Mr. Murray of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Rogers of Colorado against.

Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. McDonough for, with Mr. Camp against.

Mr. Armstrong for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Taber for, with Mr. Rabaut against.

Mr. Poulson for, with Mr. Engle against.

Mr. Chenoweth for, with Mr. Dollinger against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Durham against.

Mr. Busbey for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Price against.

Mr. Elston for, with Mr. Mack of Illinois against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. O'Neill against.

Mr. Sheehan for, with Mr. Perkins against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Sikes against.

Mr. Velde for, with Mr. Moulder against.

Mr. Golden for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Smith of Kansas for, with Mr. Byrne of New York, against.

Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Hunter for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Mr. Saylor for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. Redden for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., for, with Mr. Dawson against.

Mr. Hardie Scott for, with Mr. Baring against.

Mr. Wood of Georgia for, with Mr. Irving against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Murray of Tennessee with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Case.

Mr. Pickett with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. Teague with Mr. Meader.

Mr. Murdock with Mr. Javits.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, across the front page of the Washington Daily News is Army Secretary Frank Pace's warning that an attack on Iran and Yugoslavia by Russia may be imminent, and that "the United States may be fighting a third world war at any moment."

With the war in Korea still undecided, with the Chinese Communists building up their forces—as the Pentagon has warned—while the peace talks are on and when we have one of the top military men telling us that on two new fronts our men may be conscripted to fight in world war III—and for what? Is it to protect the British oil interests in Iran to sacrifice American men for British trade dollars? Should we not take a look at the outfit which is dragging us into this new mess?

Our refusal to accept the advice of Washington and Jefferson to avoid entanglements in the affairs of other nations is bearing bitter fruit. Is it not well that we reexamine the policy which ties us into United Nations? Is it not imperative that we now give some thought to the character of the nations to which the internationalists have bound us in this one-world organization?

In the Times-Herald of Sunday is an article by Col. Robert R. McCormick which is well worth reading, especially by those who have been citing the action taken by the Original Thirteen Colonies in establishing the United States of America, as a similar move. The columnist's statement is as follows:

When President Truman denounced the conviction of Associated Press Correspondent Oatis by Czechoslovakia, he omitted to say that Czechoslovakia is an original member of the United Nations. A great deal has been said of the conviction of the Catholic prelates in Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, secured by torture-induced confessions, and the oppression of religion in Poland, and again the fact that these countries were members in good standing in the United Nations has been avoided.

The prevailing habit of misstatement, half truth, and no statement has pretty well persuaded the ignorant that the United Nations is an enlightened, beneficial, even holy organization. The worst the well-informed thought of it was that its highfaluting language was a fraud to cover the sinister acts that got us into the Korean War.

When the organization was formed under the leadership of Alger Hiss, his treason was undreamed of; nor was the decision of the appellate court of California that it is the supreme law of the land contemplated, which partly but not entirely excuses the Senators who, under pressure of propaganda and political coercion, voted for its ratification.

The 60 countries which compose the United Nations are not similar in history, race, religion, language, and law, as were the Thirteen Original States, and as are the 48 present States. They can be divided into classifications: primitive, dictatorial, iron curtain, countries with ineffective or no constitutions, subject states, aggressor states,

states with religious political parties, polygamous states, and Socialist states.

Among the primitive states, I find Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Israel, Lebanon, Thailand, India, and Pakistan, all of them polygamous.

The dictator states: Argentina, Dominica, Paraguay.

Iron curtain states: Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Poland, Russian Soviet, Byelorussian Soviet, and Red China, which the State Department is conspiring to recognize.

States with undesirable or no constitutions: Egypt and New Zealand. Canada has no constitution, but proximity, history, and close intercourse have implanted our principles on all but the professional hatchet men and Rhodes scholars.

Aggressor states: England, which not only oppresses Egypt and Burma, but also Scotland and Wales; France, which oppresses north Africa and Indochina; the Netherlands, which oppresses Indonesia; Australia, which oppresses Borneo, and New Zealand, which oppresses several peoples in the Pacific.

The avowed purpose of the United Nations was mutual assistance against aggression by anyone. It is to be noted that no effort has been made to stop the aggressions of Britain in Egypt and Malaya; of Holland in Indonesia; of France in Morocco and Indochina; of Belgium and the Union of South Africa in Africa.

Within the last few weeks, Britain, France, and India have stated that they would join the United Nations in protecting their own possessions, but would consider whether to aid any other countries that are attacked when such a situation should arise. Of the 60 members, only 16 have sent forces to Korea, and these only token forces, except for the United States.

States with religious parties, thus violating our principle of the separation of church and state: Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Italy, and France.

Socialist states: England, Denmark, and Sweden.

States with constitutional governments are Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Luxembourg, Mexico, Norway, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, and Sweden. Some of these constitutions are obviously shaky.

The three solid Republics in the world are the United States, Turkey, and Uruguay. As I have said before, a large majority of useful inventions have been made in the United States. Of the other United Nations, only Britain, France, and Italy have made any at all.

I am not considering the countries of central and south Africa which I have not visited.

France and Great Britain, so long the dominant nations of the world, have fallen on hard times. Britain, for lack of a constitution, has become a socialized state, tyrannized over by the party in power in the House of Commons and far nearer in theory and practice to Russia than to us.

The peripatetic gyrations of France in the last 12 years are too well known to need comment. Its strongest party is the Communist Party. Both England and France have treaties of alliance with Soviet Russia.

The Appellate Court of California has held that the United Nations Charter, as the supreme law of the land, repealed the California law forbidding Japanese to own real estate in California, on the ground that the Charter was "promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

By the same theory, it would hold that the laws forbidding polygamy in this country discriminated against people practicing that custom. Ladies supporting the United Nations, bear this in mind.

The United Nations is proposing a declaration of human rights and a companion piece, a convention on freedom of information, which would replace the first amendment to our Constitution, providing for freedom of speech and of the press, with a very dangerous code to suppress freedom of religion, speech, and the press.

The genocide convention adopted by the United Nations and sent to the Senate by President Truman would render illegal a great deal of standard literature, including the New Testament.

Between the dictator states, iron curtain states, Socialist states, and primitive states, we might get a statute providing for communism and socialism in this country. That may well be the administration's object.

As well put by the Columbus (Ga.) Ledger: "The Supreme Court has never expressly declared any treaty ratified by the Senate invalid.

"This Supreme Court has upheld a law enacted to place teeth in a treaty after it had declared the same law unconstitutional before a treaty was ratified.

"This instance of the Supreme Court ruling that the treaty-making power could be used successfully where the Constitution forbade the Congress to act is pointed to by Frank E. Holman of Seattle, a former president of the American Bar Association, in an article in the September issue of the ABA Journal, entitled: 'Treaty Law Making: a Blank Check for Writing a New Constitution.'

"Here's how it came about: In 1913, Congress enacted a Federal Migratory Bird Act. After its approval by the President, its constitutionality was questioned on the grounds that it invaded the reserved powers of the States, and the statute was declared unconstitutional in 1914 by the Supreme Court in *United States v. Shauver*. The Court held:

"That the National Constitution is an enabling instrument and, therefore, Congress possess only such powers as are expressly by necessary implication granted by that instrument is not questioned. Unless, therefore, there is some provision in the National Constitution granting to Congress either expressly or by necessary implication the power to legislate on this subject, the act cannot be sustained."

"Supporters of the regulations governing the taking of migratory birds then sought the treaty route. The President concluded a treaty with Great Britain, and the Senate ratified it.

"A second Migratory Bird Act was then enacted. It was practically identical with the first, and it was attacked as unconstitutional also.

"This time, the Supreme Court, in *Missouri v. Holland*, upheld the law as valid, since it was implementation of a valid treaty.

"This decision," Mr. Holman writes, "in effect, and really for the first time, opened the way for amending the Constitution of the United States by and through a treaty, because it proclaims that an otherwise unconstitutional law may become constitutional when, as, and if the President negotiates a treaty on the subject and obtains approval of the Senate."

"This is nothing more nor less than government by treaty.

"We can lose such right as freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom of peaceful assembly if our Senate by 34 of its 96 votes ratified as a treaty the covenant on human rights."

It is plain that 40 of the 60 United Nations countries do not subscribe to our ideas of constitutional government, and many more are uncertain, and that any agreements that they can reach will be utterly destructive of our way of life.

It is equally plain that all informed people who support the United Nations plan just that.

Colonel McCormick might have added that the 13 colonies had at least a somewhat common objective and similarity of thought, believing in what we refer to as Christianity—another point in common was that the people of each colony came to America to escape persecution, excessive taxation and tyrannical authority. Finally they all agreed in open convention upon the principles laid down in the Declaration of Independence, in the Constitution, the Bill of Rights.

As Colonel McCormick clearly pointed out—

It is plain that 40 of the 60 United Nations countries do not subscribe to our ideas of constitutional government, and many more are uncertain, and that any agreements that they can reach will be utterly destructive of our way of life. It is equally plain that all informed people who support the United Nations plan just that.

With the last sentence I cannot agree, for many "informed people" sincerely believe that we can join and follow United Nations, surrender a portion of our sovereignty, but not lose our independence. I know well-informed individuals just as patriotic as I, who are entirely convinced that if we would be saved we must join United Nations. They belong to that group referred to in the good book as "having eyes, see ye not? and having ears, hear ye not? and do ye not remember?" Some never learn.

The Colonel might well have added that if and when a "show down" comes, and come it will, we will find each one of the 60 nations, if it thinks it is powerful enough, in determined disagreement with our views. Recent aid given to the Communists with whom we are at war in the Far East by Britain and other nations illustrate this point.

For my country I want no hauling down of the Stars and Stripes, no surrender of our independence, no Armed Forces of American youth fighting under an internationalist flag and commander, for the interest of some other nation, or group of nations.

I am beginning to wonder just how many wars those who advocate membership in—subjugation to—a one-world organization, United Nations, think this country can survive.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A HOSPITAL CENTER IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2094) to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2094, with Mr. DEMPSEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. May I ask about the time for discussion on the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. One hour; 30 minutes on each side.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There is some difference of opinion on this side. I think the chairman handling the bill on that side is in favor of the bill as is the ranking minority Member of this side. We would like some understanding as to whether the opposition will be recognized. I should like to have 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to know who is asking for control of the time on the Republican side.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I desire to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], and I ask the gentleman from South Carolina whether he will yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. McMILLAN. I will yield 5 minutes to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] claim 30 minutes of the time?

Mr. O'HARA. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the author of the bill.

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, this is a simple bill. We already have on the statute books an act which is known as the Hospital Center Act, which was approved August 7, 1946, and which is Public Law 647 of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

When that bill was reported favorably to the House it provided for an authorized expenditure of \$35,000,000. Of this sum about \$22,000,000 was to be made available for three hospitals, which were to comprise the Hospital Center. The balance was to be available for all other hospitals in the District which could qualify.

On the House floor the section dealing with the hospitals other than the three in the Center was stricken by a floor amendment, although the Committee on the District of Columbia reported out the bill in 1946 as I have described.

Later, in 1947, H. R. 5307 was reported favorably out of the District Committee, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] handled the report at that time for the committee.

The purpose of this is to restore to the hospital center bill the provisions that were originally contained in the bill reported out in 1946 and also as intended by H. R. 5307, which was reported out in the Eightieth Congress.

This bill, however, occupies a different status than the bill reported in the Eightieth Congress in relation to these hospitals that will benefit, in that the District Commissioners have made a favorable recommendation on this bill. In the Eightieth Congress the recommen-

82D CONGRESS
1st Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
No. 888

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

August 16, 1951.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. KIRWAN, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 3790]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 17, 25, 103, 109, and 130.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 60, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, and 125 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$200,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert *four*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: *of which not to exceed \$8,387,470 shall be available for personal services, except force account personal services, and;* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: *twenty-nine*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$41,824,750; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: *one hundred and sixty passenger motor vehicles for replacement only*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$4,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert the following: \$4,234,553; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$3,810,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$202,767,725; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert the following: \$38,104,672; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert the following: \$10,698,514; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$6,678,196; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 126:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "or", insert *by it*; and in line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "persons", insert *which*; and at the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, and before the period, insert: *Provided, That this section shall not be construed as having application to the preparation for publication of reports and maps resulting from authorized scientific and engineering investigations and surveys, to photography incident to the compilation and reproduction of maps and reports, or to photocopying of permanent records for preservation*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 127:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government in the District of Columbia whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance and two passenger motor vehicles assigned one to the Secretary and one to the Under Secretary), unless such appropriation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the compensation of employees performing such duties.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lines 4 and 5 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the words "one hundred and fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof the following: *one hundred and ten*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 131:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

SEC. 305. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: Provided, That this inhibition shall not apply—

- (a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;*
- (b) to positions filled from within the department;*
- (c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;*
- (d) to positions the personnel of which are engaged in health and safety, law enforcement, operation and maintenance, soil and moisture, and forestry activities in the field, exclusive of administrative personnel not directly connected with the operation of any such specific activity;*
- (e) to seasonal and casual workers:*

Provided further, That with the exception of the agencies and functions listed in (b) through (e) above, not more than 90 per centum of the amounts shown in the Budget estimates for personal services shall be available for such purpose: Provided further, That when the total number of personnel subject to this section has been reduced to 90 per centum of the total provided for in the Budget estimates for 1952, this section may cease to apply.

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 4, 5, 8, 10½, 14, 24, 40, 53, 57, 61, 62, 63, 72, 75, 83, 108, 124, and 129.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
FOSTER FURCOLO,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.
CARL HAYDEN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
PAT McCARRAN,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
GUY CORDON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

ENFORCEMENT OF CONNALLY HOT OIL ACT

Amendment No. 1—*Expenses*: Appropriates \$158,670 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$174,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Provides that not to exceed \$137,970 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Amendments Nos. 3, 4, and 5—*Construction*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 6—*Operation and maintenance*: Appropriates \$200,000, instead of \$275,000 as proposed by the House and \$125,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7—*Administrative provisions*: Authorizes the purchase of four automobiles, instead of five as proposed by the House and three as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8—*Continuing fund*: Reported in disagreement.

CONSTRUCTION, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$3,375,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$2,564,400 as proposed by the Senate. This action provides within the total amount appropriated the sum of \$500,000 for miscellaneous construction, \$250,000 for the purchase of electric power and energy and for leasing of transmission facilities of others, and \$810,600 for continuation of construction of the facilities designated as comprising the western Missouri project.

With respect to the western Missouri project, it is expected that a determined effort will be made by the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate with the private utilities to obtain a contract that will make unnecessary the use of this appropriation for such project and that no new obligation will be incurred under authority of this appropriation for such project unless the Secretary of the Interior determines, after such negotiations, that additional facilities of such project are required to be constructed by the Government for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer.

Amendment No. 10: Provides that not to exceed \$586,800 of the construction appropriation shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10½: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 11: Strikes out the limitation upon the use of funds for construction of the western Missouri project, as proposed by the Senate.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER
ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$1,255,712 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,275,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13: Provides that not to exceed \$900,712 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FACILITIES, DENISON DAM PROJECT

Amendment No. 14: Reported in disagreement.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, SOUTHWESTERN POWER
ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 15: Authorizes the purchase of 8 automobiles as proposed by the Senate, instead of 15 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: Strikes out unnecessary language.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Amendment No. 17—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$20,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$14,530 as proposed by the Senate.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$67,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$62,000,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees have agreed to defer action on the La Grande-Baker line owing to incomplete information indicating its immediate need. It is suggested that the Department make a further study and resubmit the authorization when more complete information is available.

Amendment No. 19: Provides that not to exceed \$8,387,470 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate, with the modification agreed to by the conferees that force account personal services shall not be included within this limitation.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$5,368,439 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,250,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21: Provides that not to exceed \$3,983,862 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Amendment No. 22: Strikes out unnecessary language.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 23—*Management of lands and resources*: Appropriates \$7,722,605, deletes earmarking of funds for soil and moisture conservation, and provides that not to exceed \$4,864,096 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate; instead of making an appropriation of \$6,900,000 without a limitation on personal services, as proposed by the House. This action ratifies the Senate approval of \$1,200,000 for soil and moisture conservation, even though it will not be earmarked in the bill.

Amendment No. 24—*Construction*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 25: Deletes the proposal of the Senate to amend the basic law relating to the distribution of receipts from sale of timber from the revested Oregon and California grant lands.

Amendment No. 26—*Administrative provisions*: Authorizes the purchase of 29 automobiles, instead of 32 as proposed by the House and 25 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Amendment No. 27—*Salaries and expenses*: Deletes the paragraph making one appropriation of \$65,000,000 for all of the activities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, as proposed by the Senate.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE SERVICES

Amendment No. 28: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 29: Deletes an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates \$41,824,750, instead of \$43,600,000 as proposed by the House and \$41,324,750 as proposed by the Senate. The amount approved for health, education, and welfare services includes \$400,000 to continue public assistance contributions to Indians in Arizona, and an additional \$100,000 for placement services, making a total of \$600,000 for placement services.

Amendment No. 31: Provides that not to exceed \$23,699,661 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate. In approving this limitation it is the intention of the conferees that it not be applied against the budgeted amounts for personal services of medical personnel, school teachers, and others essential to the hospital, disease preventative, and curative services and the educational assistance programs.

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 32: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 33: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates \$10,921,360 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$11,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35: Provides that not to exceed \$6,843,485 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 36: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 37: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$12,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 39: Provides that not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Reported in disagreement.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Amendment No. 41: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 42: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates \$3,300,747 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 44: Provides that not to exceed \$2,693,281 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

REVOLVING FUND FOR LOANS

Amendment No. 45: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 46: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

PAYMENT TO CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW NATIONS OF INDIANS, OKLAHOMA

Amendment No. 47: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 48: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates \$22,655 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$25,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 50: Provides that not to exceed \$21,105 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 51: Authorizes the purchase of 160 automobiles, instead of 191 as proposed by the House and 125 as proposed by the Senate.

TRIBAL FUNDS

Amendment No. 52: Makes a grammatical change.

Amendment No. 53: Reported in disagreement.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates \$4,500,000, instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,600,000 as proposed by the Senate. This action ratifies the action of the Senate in approving \$100,000 for investigations of the Collbran project, Colorado.

Amendment No. 55: Provides that not to exceed \$4,234,553 shall be available for personal services, instead of \$3,163,396 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56: Provides that \$3,810,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund, instead of \$3,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,903,500 as proposed by the Senate.

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

Amendment No. 57: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 58: Appropriates \$202,767,725, instead of \$197,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$208,535,450 as proposed by the Senate. The allotment of the appropriation to the projects covered by the budget estimates is left to the administrative determination of the Secretary of the Interior with the understanding that funds will not be allocated in excess of the respective sums indicated in column 4 of the project breakdown appearing at pages 15 and 16 of Senate Report No. 499, and that there will be no allocation of current year or prior appropriations for any project item not heretofore appropriated for or included in the fiscal 1952 program presented to Congress or for any project item eliminated by the action of the House, the Senate, or both, upon the budget estimates, with the following exceptions: The managers on the part of the both Houses agree that of the 1952 appropriation \$191,000 is to be available for operation and maintenance of the All-American Canal as provided for in the Senate report; that \$500,000 is to be available for the initiation of construction of a single circuit 230-kilovolt transmission line, for other than customer service, from Folsom Dam power plant to interconnect at the nearest feasible point with the east side Shasta-Tracy transmission line; that the Secretary should make available from unobligated balances of prior appropriations approximately \$1,463,000 for emergency work on the Middle Rio Grande project, New Mexico; and that the proposed allocation of an additional \$185,000 to the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, is not approved.

It is to be understood that this action by the conferees expressly denies any appropriation for the following transmission facilities:

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

	<i>Amount of 1952 estimate</i>
Keswick-Tracy via Elverta 115-kilovolt line-----	\$1, 400, 000
Port Chicago-Mare Island 115-kilovolt line and 2 substations-----	300, 000
Tracy-Patterson-Naval Supply 69-kilovolt line and 2 substations---	450, 000
CVP-BPA interconnection and substation, 230-kilovolt, including \$400,000 contained in S. Doc. 39-----	2, 100, 000
Tracy-Livermore-Ames Laboratory line and substation-----	700, 000
Tracy-Contra Costa-Clayton-Ygnacio 69-kilovolt line and 2 substa- tions-----	201, 170
Keswick-Shasta Dam area PUD 115-kilovolt line and substation----	105, 308
Elverta-Sacramento switchyard-----	150, 000
Total 1952 estimate disallowed-----	5, 406, 478

COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT, COLORADO

The \$100,000 included in the 1952 budget estimates for the Estes-Leyner 115-kilovolt transmission line has been disallowed, but for the Estes power plant-Pole Hill power plant 115-kilovolt line \$100,000 has been approved for the 1952 program.

MINIDOKA PROJECT, AMERICAN FALLS POWER DIVISION, IDAHO

	<i>Amount of 1952 estimate</i>
American Falls power plant.....	\$1, 067, 000
American Falls switchyard.....	133, 000
Transmission line (American Falls-Minidoka Dam).....	100, 000
Total 1952 estimate disallowed.....	1, 300, 000

TRANSMISSION DIVISION, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

	<i>Amount of 1952 estimate</i>
Canyon Ferry-Great Falls 115-kilovolt line and substation.....	\$753, 450
Canyon Ferry-Three Forks-Anaconda 115-kilovolt lines and sub- stations.....	703, 000
Miles City-Yellowtail 115-kilovolt lines and substations.....	85, 000
Yellowtail-Billings 115-kilovolt lines and substations.....	810, 000
Sioux City-Omaha line.....	207, 463
Omaha substation.....	70, 242
Sioux City-Storm Lake line.....	118, 428
Storm Lake-Denison-Holland-Omaha line.....	30, 624
Sioux City-Sibley line.....	467, 643
Additional reduction.....	500, 490
Total 1952 estimate disallowed.....	3, 746, 340

The managers on the part of both Houses strongly reaffirm the language contained in the House committee report accompanying H. R. 3790 with reference to prohibiting the proposed interconnection of the Central Valley power system and the Bonneville power system. Reports have been received that work on the proposed intertie has continued despite the categoric denial of funds in the reports issued by the Appropriations Committees of both the House and the Senate this year and approved by both Houses of Congress, and a similar categoric injunction last year approved by both Houses of Congress denying the use of funds for this purpose.

The conferees hereby request the Secretary of the Interior to submit immediately a full and complete report including disciplinary action taken by him in this case.

Amendment No. 59: Provides that not to exceed \$38,104,672 shall be available for personal services, instead of \$29,160,408 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 60: Provides that \$28,972,650 shall be derived from the reclamation fund as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$29,202,200 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 61: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 62: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 63: Reported in disagreement.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Amendment No. 64: Appropriates \$15,977,594 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$15,094,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 65: Strikes out unnecessary words.

Amendment No. 66: Provides that \$12,476,494 shall be derived from the reclamation fund as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$12,592,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 67: Strikes out unnecessary words.

Amendment No. 68: Provides that not to exceed \$10,698,514 shall be available for personal services, instead of \$10,331,434 as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Amendment No. 69: Appropriates \$5,478,203 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 70: Provides that not to exceed \$4,696,178 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

EMERGENCY FUND

Amendment No. 71: Appropriates \$400,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$500,000 as proposed by the House.

TRANSFER OF FACILITIES, FORT PECK PROJECT, MONTANA

Amendment No. 72: Reported in disagreement.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 73: Authorizes not to exceed \$50,000 for consultant services as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$30,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 74: Increases to \$100 per day the amount that can be paid for consultant services as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$50 per day as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 75: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 76 and 77: Strike out limitations inserted by the House, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, and 83—*Coachella distribution system*: Authorize expenditures of not to exceed \$2,783,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of not to exceed \$1,684,000 as proposed by the House, for completion of construction of the Coachella division of the All-American Canal system; make the expenditure of such funds mandatory as proposed by the Senate, instead of permissive as proposed by the House; and instead of requiring a definite repayment arrangement in advance of expenditure as proposed by the House, adopt the proposal of the Senate that such expenditure shall be repayable unless it shall be judicially determined by a court of competent jurisdiction that the irrigation district is not liable therefor. Amendment No. 83 is reported in disagreement.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Amendment No. 84: Appropriates \$21,300,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$21,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 85: Provides that not to exceed \$13,455,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF MINES

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES

Amendment No. 86: Appropriates \$16,858,603 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$17,950,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees have approved \$356,000 for control of fires in inactive coal deposits, such sum to be absorbed from the total appropriation

approved for the conservation and development of mineral resources. The entire amount of the budget estimate for engineering and other research on the development and production of petroleum and natural gas has been approved by the conferees. No reduction is to be made in the sums to be available for personal services with respect to the two afore-mentioned activities: \$91,775 is to be available for personal services at the Laramie Station and \$545,572 is to be available for personal services at the Bartlettville Station.

Amendment No. 87: Provides that not to exceed \$10,446,575 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 88: Appropriates \$1,587,412 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,250,000 as proposed by the House. This action includes approval of \$350,000 for completion of the pilot plant started during World War II at Laramie, Wyo., for research by the Bureau of Mines on the production of alumina from low-grade ores. The ores to be experimented with are different from bauxite ores found in other areas of the country. In approving this appropriation it is the intent of the conferees that, even though the experimental operations will not be financed from this appropriation, no research shall be conducted at this station on processes or methods, whether patented or not, unless all royalty and other valuable rights to developments or discoveries from such research accrue exclusively to the Government.

Amendment No. 89: Provides that not to exceed \$113,287 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Amendment No. 90: Appropriates \$1,176,841 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,290,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 91: Provides that not to exceed \$1,018,434 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

Amendment No. 92: Provides that not to exceed \$6,584,342 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

Amendment No. 93: Appropriates \$7,369,790 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$7,300,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 94: Provides that not to exceed \$4,193,747 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 95: Appropriates \$11,370,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$11,975,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 96: Provides that not to exceed \$945,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Amendment No. 97: Appropriates \$1,171,774 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,284,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 98: Provides that not to exceed \$1,014,538 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES

Amendment No. 99: Appropriates \$6,678,196, instead of \$6,870,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,606,558 as proposed by the Senate. This action restores the amount of \$263,442 contained in the budget estimate for river basin studies except that the entire sum appropriated is to be subject to the reduction in funds to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 100: Provides that not to exceed \$4,259,363 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

Amendment No. 101: Appropriates \$3,858,986 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,875,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 102: Provides that not to exceed \$2,487,629 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 103: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to prevent the use of this appropriation for investigations, surveys, and similar work in foreign countries.

CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 104: Appropriates \$733,742 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$750,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 105: Provides that not to exceed \$146,324 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Amendment No. 106: Appropriates \$806,631 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$882,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 107: Provides that not to exceed \$678,319 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

Amendment No. 108—*Administration of Territories*: Reported in disagreement.

ALASKA PUBLIC WORKS

Amendment No. 109: Appropriates \$7,000,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$8,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 110: Provides that not to exceed \$463,000 shall be available for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$500,000 for this purpose as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 111: Provides that not to exceed \$333,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

CONSTRUCTION OF ROADS, ALASKA

Amendment No. 112: Provides that not to exceed \$2,493,000 shall be available for personal services, as provided by the Senate.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF ROADS, ALASKA

Amendment No. 113: Appropriates \$2,900,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 114. Provides that not to exceed \$1,935,840 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS (ALASKA ROAD COMMISSION)

Amendment No. 115: Provides that not to exceed 20 percent of the construction appropriation be available for force account work as proposed by the Senate, instead of not to exceed 25 percent as proposed by the House.

VIRGIN ISLANDS PUBLIC WORKS

Amendment No. 116: Appropriates \$992,970 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 117: Provides that not to exceed \$63,270 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 118: Inserts a proviso that no part of the appropriation shall be used for waterfront development work on St. Thomas and provides that the amount included in the 1952 budget estimates for such work be made available for school and hospital facilities, as proposed by the Senate.

ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Amendment No. 119: *Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary*: Appropriates \$2,154,911 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 120: Provides that not to exceed \$1,890,798 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

RESCISSION OF UNUSED CONTRACT AUTHORITY

Amendment No. 121: Strikes out the word "unused" and in lieu thereof inserts the word "unobligated", as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 122: Changes the effective date of the rescission from June 30, 1951, as proposed by the House, to June 30, 1952, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 123: Adopts the Senate proposal to strike out the words "except public works in the Virgin Islands".

TRANSFERS OF PROPERTY—OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

Amendment No. 124: Reported in disagreement.

VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

Amendment No. 125: Appropriates \$2,595,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,800,000 as proposed by the House.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

EXPENDITURES FOR INFORMATIONAL AND PROPAGANDA PURPOSES

Amendment No. 126: Strikes out the proposal of the House for limiting the use of funds for propaganda purposes, and adopts the proposal of the Senate to impose limitations upon expenditures for such purposes; but modifies the Senate proposal by adding at the end thereof a provision that the limitation shall not apply to the publication of reports and maps resulting from authorized scientific and engineering investigations and surveys or to photography incident to the compilation and reproduction of maps and reports or to photocopying of permanent records for preservation.

LIMITATION ON EMPLOYMENT OF CHAUFFEURS

Amendment No. 127: Adopts the amendment of the Senate limiting the employment of chauffeurs of Government-owned cars, but restricts its operation to the District of Columbia and excepts the automobile assigned to the Secretary and that assigned to the Under Secretary.

EMPLOYEES ENGAGED IN PERSONNEL WORK

Amendment No. 128: Adopts the amendment of the Senate limiting the number of persons to be engaged in personnel work, but changes the proposed ratio of 1 such employee to 115 employees to 1 such employee to 110 employees.

ANTISTRIKE PROVISION

Amendment No. 129: Reported in disagreement.

EXPENDITURES DURING FINAL QUARTER OF FISCAL YEAR

Amendment No. 130: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to limit the expenditures for certain purposes during the last quarter of the fiscal year to not to exceed the average quarterly amount of such expenditures during the preceding three quarters of the fiscal year, except where the Director of the Bureau of the Budget authorizes otherwise. It is the intention of the conferees that excessive last-quarter purchases be prevented so that accumulated last-quarter balances revert to the Treasury.

LIMITATION ON FILLING VACANCIES

Amendment No. 131: Strikes out the House provision limiting the filling of vacancies and the Senate proposal enumerating reductions already made in the various paragraphs throughout the bill, and inserts a modified proposal for limiting the filling of vacancies. Section (d) of the modified proposal enumerates several categories of essential employment which are exempted from the inhibition on filling vacancies. In order to obviate questions as to the scope of such exempt categories it is intended that the following sums be exempted with respect to each:

Health and safety	\$3, 092, 862
Law enforcement	630, 835
Operation and maintenance	50, 270, 408
Soil and moisture	2, 323, 266
Forestry	1, 976, 379
Total	58, 293, 750

It is intended that the exemptions not include supervisory, clerical, and related types of personnel, such as "white collar" administrative personnel, not directly connected with the operation of any such specific field activity.

It is also intended that all savings effected pursuant to the modified restriction recommended with respect to filling vacancies are not to be expended for other purposes but that any such sums are to be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
FOSTER FURCOLO,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.



accomplishing the policies and purpose of this act—

(1) not to exceed \$5,028,000,000 for assistance pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1571-1604), for countries which are parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and for any country of Europe (other than a country covered by another title of this act), which the President determines to be of direct importance to the defense of the North Atlantic area and whose increased ability to defend itself the President determines is important to the preservation of the peace and security of the North Atlantic area and to the security of the United States. In addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for carrying out the purposes of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, through assistance to any of the countries covered by this paragraph are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this paragraph.

(2) not to exceed \$1,335,000,000 for assistance pursuant to the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501-1522) (including assistance to further European military production), for any country of Europe covered by paragraph (1) of this subsection and for any other country covered by section 103 (a) of the said Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended. In addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for carrying out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this subsection: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$30,000,000 of the funds made available pursuant to this subsection may be utilized to effectuate the purposes of section 115 (e) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

(b) Not to exceed 5 percent of the total of the appropriations granted pursuant to this section may be transferred, when determined by the President to be necessary for the purposes of this act, between appropriations granted pursuant to either paragraph of subsection (a): *Provided*, That the amount herein authorized to be transferred shall be determined without reference to any balances of prior appropriations continued available pursuant to this section: *Provided further*, That, whenever the President makes any such determination, he shall forthwith notify the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 2, line 22, section 101 (a), subsection (1), strike out "\$5,028,000,000" and insert "\$4,828,000,000"; and in subsection (2) on page 3, line 16, strike out "\$1,335,000,000" and insert "\$1,035,000,000."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain this amendment shortly to the House so that you will get the impact of the cuts of each of subsections (1) and (2).

Subsection (1) on page 2 of title I is the military assistance for Europe. In the bill at present the figure is \$5,028,000,000, as you will note in line 22. The figure in my amendment will reduce the \$5,028,000,000 by \$200,000,000, to \$4,828,000,000.

Then, if you turn to page 3 on line 16, you will see subsection 2, which refers

to economic assistance under title I, which item now provides for \$1,335,000,000. The figure of my amendment would be \$1,035,000,000, thereby reducing it \$300,000,000.

The total effect of my amendment upon title I is a \$500,000,000 reduction. The question then comes up, where can that amount come out? My amendment leaves it pretty much up to the President to determine where the cut can best come, because if you will take subsection B on page 4, you will find that not to exceed 5 percent of the total appropriations granted in subsections (1) and (2) can be switched back and forth between the two subsections. If we take 5 percent of about \$5,000,000,000 in title I, for example, we arrive at a figure of \$250,000,000. So that right in out figure of the \$5,028,000,000 in the act as it now stands for military assistance for Europe, there is a possible transfer of a possible \$250,000,000 for economic assistance, moving that amount over to subsection 2 on page 3. Likewise in the \$1,335,000,000 item for economic assistance for Europe on page 3, the President, according to the terms of the bill, can take 5 percent out of that which would be about \$66,750,000, which he can transfer from economic assistance to military assistance in title I.

That provision gives a freedom of action and takes away the rigidity so that there is not the excuse that this is simply cutting the military aid by express legislative direction. The President can then look at the program and see where it is best to take the \$500,000,000 off, and do his cutting there. Because of this very good provision under section B on page 4, the 5-percent provision, we have a flexibility of handling which permits a good program to be worked out between military assistance and economic assistance under title 1.

It also should be remembered that the economic assistance includes assistance to further military production. So that when we come to a definition, we find that there is a very fine dividing line between what is actually military assistance, and what becomes economic assistance under this legislation. For example, if we are giving the recipient countries machinery for fabricating the future plants for arms production, the query is: Is that military assistance or is that economic assistance? If the United States give these countries a machine which is a die, or a tool, grinder, or shaping machine, the question is: If it is used now to produce arms under this program, might this same item not likewise be general economic assistance to such country if it can be used later, after this program is completed in the contemplated 36 months?

In addition to that matter of flexibility and difficulty of definition, you will find there is an item under military assistance that is on page 65 of the report of the committee, table 12, illustrative breakdown of 1952 mutual security program, military assistance subsection (b), which shows \$53,000,000 in the present bill for administrative expenses for the \$5,000,000,000 military-assistance item under title 1.

Under the same table 12, economic assistance under ECA act section (2), subsection (f), you will find there is an item of \$19,000,000 for administrative expenses also. So that if you go through the bill, you will find that there are many places whereby good business methods there can be a further cutting down on overload and a cutting to the minimum of further indirect expenses.

By good purchasing and good planning and programming, our United States agencies can certainly come up with a program, which if it is called an austerity program, nevertheless, is a program which is calculated to do the job required if economy and business methods are employed. I believe \$200,000,000 reduction on \$5,000,000,000 military assistance, is a very slight reduction on the military assistance program. On the \$1,335,000,000 economic assistance, a \$300,000,000 reduction just means they will have to take a little bit more of this austerity program that our taxpayers in this country are having to take today. There is no doubt these countries have now completed their postwar recovery and have exceeded our hopes of success under the Marshall plan proposal. Many of them are spending much less in proportion of their total annual productions for defense than we are, and in some of the recipient countries, the tax and debt burden is now less proportionately than ours.

Mr. RICHARDS. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes to answer the gentleman's inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it cuts \$200,000,000 from the military aid in title I, and also \$300,000,000 from the economic aid in title I.

Mr. FULTON. That is correct. \$500,000,000 is the total proposed cut in title I, of the amendment which I have introduced.

Mr. RICHARDS. This committee was in session about 6 weeks. We sat about 31 days and had 60 or 70 hearings. Did the gentleman at any time while this committee was meeting propose any such cut as this?

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman is right, I did not suggest this amendment during the hearings, but I was working on a cut just as the gentleman and others. I did not come up with this final figure until this afternoon, because I was spending 3 hours more this afternoon working on it. But I have had these figures previously as to places where the cuts should be made and where they should not be made. For instance, on the \$2,658,000 for ocean freight, I do not

think the House should make any cut there at all. But I might say this to the chairman, that I have heard, outside the committee walls, items of figures discussed. One thing that struck me very forcibly was a figure that one of the members came up with, and when asked where he got it he said, "I took that one right off the top of my head." If there is that much flexibility of figures in this program the question is one of policy rather than the particular percentage or exact rate of cut. I believe, as a matter of policy, that we could go a little further than the chairman of the committee has gone in making his own cuts on the military assistance in title I, and quite a bit further on the economic assistance in title I. I agree, in part, with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] who spoke of our building plants beyond a certain necessary norm of recovery, because we are then building plants for our competition. There are complaints, for example from Pennsylvania, of foreign companies, of recipient countries, laying down fabricated steel items in Central and South America cheaper than we can—not once, but consistently—when our own plants are completely tied up for the defense of Europe and when those countries have an excess capacity to export, even to the Soviet, perhaps we had better cut some of the money for assistance.

My proposed cut will not hurt the aim of the program, but it will certainly make it more economical and efficient.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the cut of \$200,000,000 in the military aid program under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, and \$300,000,000 cut in the economic assistance for Europe as proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton]. I think it is a little ironical that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton] did not see fit to bring up in the committee the proposal which he is now making to the membership of this body. Other members of the committee did bring up proposals to cut this amount, and those proposals were fully considered and the result is that we have before us a bill which the chairman of the committee, primarily, though the committee generally, is responsible for. I think that the distinguished and able chairman of our committee the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Richards] has done an outstanding job. I think he has presented a bill to this House which is a committee bill and not a State Department bill or a bill from any other part of the executive branch of the Government. I think also, in considering this bill and this amendment, that we have to keep in mind the fact that Europe is in many respects the key point in the defense system of the world, because there you have, especially in the Ruhr, the coal, the steel, the iron, and the industrial know-how which the USSR so greatly covets.

I would like to call to the attention of the committee a statement made by

General Eisenhower. He stated to the group visiting Europe 2 months ago that in his opinion the atom bomb was not the greatest deterrent in holding back the Russians, but that the industrial capacity of the United States was. We have clear superiority, as far as our industrial output is concerned at the present time, especially so because of the fact that we are in mutuality, so to speak, with the industrial output of Western Europe. If we were to lose that output, it would mean in effect that the USSR would be on a practically equal footing with us. It would mean then that we would be in real danger. If we cut down this assistance which will help the industrial development of Western Europe, we are only weakening ourselves.

We must remember that the United States and Western Europe now have an annual production of steel and pig iron more than four times that of the Soviet world; together we produce three times as much coal and ten times as much petroleum. Move the resources of Western Europe to the Soviet side and the comparisons change drastically. I feel also that if we cut down the military aid, as proposed, that we will be doing the very thing we should not be doing and that is to bring into being a force not well enough equipped and not as able as it must be to defend itself in any struggle which might occur. We would also be diluting their potential strength and smashing their hopes for a more secure and peaceful future.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman recalls the emphasis which has been given to this problem by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Herter], in which he has continually pleaded with us not to think in terms of money primarily but in terms of tanks, planes, bazookas, and specific items of war. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. It is not the gentleman's opinion based upon the testimony before our committee that if the amendment prevails you are not reducing for you are forced to think in terms of the planes, tanks, and equipment that will move into the stepped up armaments need of Europe.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is right.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. And that the figure here represents the very minimum in the calculations of General Eisenhower and others who have laid the plans for this program. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is a very fair and a very accurate statement. I may say also, and this is repetition—it is not a question of a limit of manpower in western European nations; they are willing to furnish the men; but what is the use of furnishing the men if you do not give them something to fight with, if you do not give them something to train with? This money is necessary therefore because many of these items such as planes and tanks take a long time to manufacture and most of this

hardware must, for the time being at least, be manufactured in this country for the military program in Western Europe. Arrangements are being made that certain items such as small arms and the like, and certain spare parts will be manufactured in Europe and will take their part in the program of preparedness now being undertaken under the North Atlantic Treaty and the Mutual Defense Assistance Program.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be against the interest of the United States and our own security if we were to vote for this amendment.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HERTER. In view of the fact that this amendment affects two different subsections, one dealing with military aid and the other with economic aid, can it not be separated and a separate vote be had on each part?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, it can be separated.

Mr. HERTER. It can be divided. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, it is now 5 minutes after 5. I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5113) to maintain the security and promote the foreign policy and provide for the general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international peace and security, had come to no resolution thereon.

DEFENSE HOUSING AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES ACT OF 1951

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 349) to assist the provision of housing and community facilities and services required in connection with the national defense, insist on the House amendments thereto, agree to the conference asked by the Senate, and that conferees be appointed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, PATMAN, RAINS, WOLCOTT, GAMBLE, and COLE of Kansas.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 888)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 17, 25, 103, 109, and 130.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 60, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, and 125, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "four"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "of which not to exceed \$8,387,470 shall be available for personal services, except force account personal services, and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "twenty-nine"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$41,824,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "one hundred and sixty passenger motor vehicles for replacement only"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert the following: "\$4,234,553"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,810,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$202,767,725"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert the following: "\$38,104,672"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert the following: "\$10,698,514"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,678,196"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 126: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line two of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "or", insert "by it"; and in line four of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "persons", insert "which"; and at the end of the matter inserted by said amendment and before the period, insert ": *Provided*, That this section shall not be construed as having application to the preparation for publication of reports and maps resulting from authorized scientific and engineering investigations and surveys, to photography incident to the compilation and reproduction of maps and reports, or to photocopying of permanent records for preservation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 127: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Sec. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government in the District of Columbia whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance and two passenger motor vehicles assigned one to the Secretary and one to the Under Secretary), unless such appropriation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the compensation of employees performing such duties."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lines four and five of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the words "one hundred and fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "one hundred and ten"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 131: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out

and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Sec. 305. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the department;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to positions the personnel of which are engaged in health and safety, law enforcement, operation and maintenance, soil and moisture, and forestry activities in the field, exclusive of administrative personnel not directly connected with the operation of any such specific activity;

"(e) to seasonal and casual workers:

Provided further, That with the exception of the agencies and functions listed in (b) through (e) above, not more than 90 per centum of the amounts shown in the Budget estimates for personal services shall be available for such purpose: *Provided further*, That when the total number of personnel subject to this section has been reduced to 90 per centum of the total provided for in the Budget estimates for 1952, this section may cease to apply."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 4, 5, 8, 10½, 14, 24, 40, 53, 57, 61, 62, 63, 72, 75, 83, 108, 124, and 129.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,

W. F. NORRELL,

HENRY M. JACKSON,

FOSTER FURCOLO,

CLARENCE CANNON,

BEN F. JENSEN,

IVOR D. FENTON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,

PAT MCCARRAN,

DENNIS CHAVEZ,

GUY CORDON,

KENNETH S. WHERRY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Enforcement of Connally Hot Oil Act

Amendment No. 1—Expenses: Appropriates \$158,670 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$174,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Provides that not to exceed \$137,970 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Southeastern Power Administration

Amendments Nos. 3, 4, and 5—Construction: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 6—Operation and maintenance: Appropriates \$200,000, instead of \$275,000 as proposed by the House and \$125,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7—Administrative provisions: Authorizes the purchase of four auto-

mobiles, instead of five as proposed by the House and three as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8—Continuing fund: Reported in disagreement.

Construction, Southwestern Power Administration

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$3,375,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$2,564,400 as proposed by the Senate. This action provides within the total amount appropriated the sum of \$500,000 for miscellaneous construction, \$250,000 for the purchase of electric power and energy and for leasing of transmission facilities of others, and \$810,600 for continuation of construction of the facilities designated as comprising the western Missouri project.

With respect to the western Missouri project, it is expected that a determined effort will be made by the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate with the private utilities to obtain a contract that will make unnecessary the use of this appropriation for such project and that no new obligation will be incurred under authority of this appropriation for such project unless the Secretary of the Interior determines, after such negotiations, that additional facilities of such project are required to be constructed by the Government for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer.

Amendment No. 10: Provides that not to exceed \$586,800 of the construction appropriation shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10½: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 11: Strikes out the limitation upon the use of funds for construction of the western Missouri project, as proposed by the Senate.

Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$1,255,712 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,275,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13: Provides that not to exceed \$900,712 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Transfer of certain facilities, Denison Dam project

Amendment No. 14: Reported in disagreement.

Administrative provisions, Southwestern Power Administration

Amendment No. 15: Authorizes the purchase of 8 automobiles as proposed by the Senate, instead of 15 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: Strikes out unnecessary language.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Amendment No. 17—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$20,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$14,530 as proposed by the Senate.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Construction

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$67,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$62,000,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees have agreed to defer action on the La Grande-Baker line owing to incomplete information indicating its immediate need. It is suggested that the Department make a further study and resubmit the authorization when more complete information is available.

Amendment No. 19: Provides that not to exceed \$8,387,470 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate, with the modification agreed to by the conferees that force account personal services shall not be included within this limitation.

Operation and maintenance

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$5,368,439 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,250,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21: Provides that not to exceed \$3,983,862 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Administrative provision

Amendment No. 22: Strikes out unnecessary language.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 23—Management of lands and resources: Appropriates \$7,722,605, deletes earmarking of funds for soil and moisture conservation, and provides that not to exceed \$4,864,096 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate; instead of making an appropriation of \$6,900,000 without a limitation on personal services, as proposed by the House. This action ratifies the Senate approval of \$1,200,000 for soil and moisture conservation, even though it will not be earmarked in the bill.

Amendment No. 24—Construction: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 25: Deletes the proposal of the Senate to amend the basic law relating to the distribution of receipts from sale of timber from the re-vested Oregon and California grant lands.

Amendment No. 26—Administrative provisions: Authorizes the purchase of 29 automobiles, instead of 32 as proposed by the House and 25 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Amendment No. 27—Salaries and expenses: Deletes the paragraph making one appropriation of \$65,000,000 for all of the activities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, as proposed by the Senate.

Health, education, and welfare services

Amendment No. 28: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 29: Deletes an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates \$41,824,750, instead of \$43,600,000 as proposed by the House and \$41,324,750 as proposed by the Senate. The amount approved for health, education, and welfare services includes \$400,000 to continue public assistance contributions to Indians in Arizona, and an additional \$100,000 for placement services, making a total of \$600,000 for placement services.

Amendment No. 31: Provides that not to exceed \$23,699,661 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate. In approving this limitation it is the intention of the conferees that it not be applied against the budgeted amounts for personal services of medical personnel, school teachers, and others essential to the hospital, disease preventative, and curative services and the educational assistance programs.

Resources management

Amendment No. 32: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 33: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates \$10,921,360 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$11,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35: Provides that not to exceed \$6,843,485 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Construction

Amendment No. 36: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 37: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$12,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 39: Provides that not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Reported in disagreement.

General administrative expenses

Amendment No. 41: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 42: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates \$3,300,747 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 44: Provides that not to exceed \$2,693,281 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Revolving fund for loans

Amendment No. 45: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 46: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Payment to Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians, Oklahoma

Amendment No. 47: Inserts a heading.

Amendment No. 48: Strikes out an unnecessary heading.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates \$22,655 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$25,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 50: Provides that not to exceed \$21,105 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Administrative provisions

Amendment No. 51: Authorizes the purchase of 160 automobiles, instead of 191 as proposed by the House and 125 as proposed by the Senate.

Tribal funds

Amendment No. 52: Makes a grammatical change.

Amendment No. 53: Reported in disagreement.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

General investigations

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates \$4,500,000, instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,600,000 as proposed by the Senate. This action ratifies the action of the Senate in approving \$100,000 for investigations of the Colbran project, Colorado.

Amendment No. 55: Provides that not to exceed \$4,234,553 shall be available for personal services, instead of \$3,163,396 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56: Provides that \$3,810,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund, instead of \$3,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,903,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Construction and rehabilitation

Amendment No. 57: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 58: Appropriates \$202,767,725, instead of \$197,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$208,535,450 as proposed by the Senate. The allotment of the appropriation to the projects covered by the budget estimates is left to the administrative determination of the Secretary of the Interior with the understanding that funds will not be allocated in excess of the respective sums indicated in column 4 of the project breakdown appearing at pages 15 and 16 of Senate Report No. 499, and that there will be no allocation of current year or prior appropriations for any project item not heretofore appropriated for or included in the fiscal 1952 program presented to Congress or for any project item eliminated by the action of the House, the Senate, or both, upon the budget estimates, with the following exceptions: The managers on the part of the both Houses agree that of the 1952 appropriation \$191,000 is to be available for operation and maintenance of the All-American Canal, as provided for in the Senate report; that \$500,000 is to be available for the initiation of construction of a single circuit 230-kilovolt transmission line, for other than customer service, from Folsom Dam power plant to interconnect at the

nearest feasible point with the east side Shasta-Tracy transmission line; that the Secretary should make available from unobligated balances of prior appropriations approximately \$1,463,000 for emergency work on the Middle Rio Grande project, New Mexico; and that the proposed allocation of an additional \$185,000 to the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, is not approved.

It is to be understood that this action by the conferees expressly denies any appropriation for the following transmission facilities:

Central Valley project, California

	Amount of 1952 estimate
Keswick-Tracy via Elverta 115-kilovolt line.....	\$1,400,000
Port Chicago-Mare Island 115-kilovolt line and 2 substations.....	300,000
Tracy-Patterson-Naval Supply 69-kilovolt line and 2 substations.....	450,000
CVP-BPA interconnection and substation, 230-kilovolt, including \$400,000 contained in S. Doc. 39.....	2,100,000
Tracy-Livermore-Ames Laboratory line and substation.....	700,000
Tracy- Contra Costa- Clayton-Ygnacio 69-kilovolt line and 2 substations.....	201,170
Keswick-Shasta Dam area PUD 115-kilovolt line and substation.....	105,308
Elverta-Sacramento switchyard.....	150,000
Total 1952 estimate disallowed.....	5,406,478

Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado

The \$100,000 included in the 1952 budget estimates for the Estes-Leyner 115-kilovolt transmission line has been disallowed, but for the Estes power plant-Pole Hill power plant 115-kilovolt line \$100,000 has been approved for the 1952 program.

Minidoka project, American Falls power division, Idaho

	Amount of 1952 estimate
American Falls power plant.....	\$1,067,000
American Falls switchyard.....	133,000
Transmission line (American Falls-Minidoka Dam).....	100,000
Total 1952 estimate disallowed.....	1,300,000

Transmission division, Missouri River Basin

	Amount of 1952 estimate
Canyon Ferry-Great Falls 115-kilovolt line and substation.....	\$753,450
Canyon Ferry-Three Forks-Anaconda 115-kilovolt lines and substations.....	703,000
Miles City-Yellowtail 115-kilovolt lines and substations.....	85,000
Yellowtail-Billings 115-kilovolt lines and substations.....	810,000
Sioux City-Omaha line.....	207,463
Omaha substation.....	70,242
Sioux City-Storm Lake line.....	118,428
Storm Lake-Denison-Holland-Omaha line.....	30,624
Sioux City-Sibley line.....	467,643
Additional reduction.....	500,490
Total 1952 estimate disallowed.....	3,746,340

The managers on the part of both Houses strongly reaffirm the language contained in the House committee report accompanying H. R. 4790 with reference to prohibiting the proposed interconnection of the Central Valley power system and the Bonneville power system. Reports have been received

that work on the proposed Intertie has continued despite the categorical denial of funds in the reports issued by the Appropriations Committees of both the House and the Senate this year and approved by both Houses of Congress, and a similar categorical injunction last year approved by both Houses of Congress denying the use of funds for this purpose.

The conferees hereby request the Secretary of the Interior to submit immediately a full and complete report including disciplinary action taken by him in this case.

Amendment No. 59: Provides that not to exceed \$38,104,672 shall be available for personal services, instead of \$29,160,408 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 60: Provides that \$28,972,650 shall be derived from the reclamation fund as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$29,202,200 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 61: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 62: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 63: Reported in disagreement.

Operation and maintenance

Amendment No. 64: Appropriates \$15,977,594 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$15,094,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 65: Strikes out unnecessary words.

Amendment No. 66: Provides that \$12,476,494 shall be derived from the reclamation fund as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$12,592,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 67: Strikes out unnecessary words.

Amendment No. 68: Provides that not to exceed \$10,698,514 shall be available for personal services, instead of \$10,331,434 as proposed by the Senate.

General administrative expenses

Amendment No. 69: Appropriates \$5,478,203 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 70: Provides that not to exceed \$4,696,178 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Emergency fund

Amendment No. 71: Appropriates \$400,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$500,000 as proposed by the House.

Transfer of facilities, Fort Peck project, Montana

Amendment No. 72: Reported in disagreement.

Administrative provisions

Amendment No. 73: Authorizes not to exceed \$50,000 for consultant services as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$30,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 74: Increases to \$100 per day the amount that can be paid for consultant services as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$50 per day as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 75: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 76 and 77: Strike out limitations inserted by the House, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, and 83—Coachella distribution system: Authorize expenditures of not to exceed \$2,783,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of not to exceed \$1,684,000 as proposed by the House, for completion of construction of the Coachella division of the All-American Canal system; make the expenditure of such funds mandatory as proposed by the Senate, instead of permissive as proposed by the House; and instead of requiring a definite repayment arrangement in advance of expenditure as proposed by the House, adopt the proposal of the Senate that such expenditure shall be repayable unless it shall be judicially determined by a court of compe-

tent jurisdiction that the Irrigation district is not liable therefor. Amendment No. 83 is reported in disagreement.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Amendment No. 84: Appropriates \$21,300,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$21,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 85: Provides that not to exceed \$13,455,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF MINES

Conservation and development of mineral resources

Amendment No. 86: Appropriates \$16,858,603 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$17,950,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees have approved \$356,000 for control of fires in inactive coal deposits, such sum to be absorbed from the total appropriation approved for the conservation and development of mineral resources. The entire amount of the budget estimate for engineering and other research on the development and production of petroleum and natural gas has been approved by the conferees. No reduction is to be made in the sums to be available for personal services with respect to the two afore-mentioned activities: \$91,775 is to be available for personal services at the Laramie Station and \$545,572 is to be available for personal services at the Bartlettville Station.

Amendment No. 87: Provides that not to exceed \$10,446,575 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Construction

Amendment No. 88: Appropriates \$1,587,412 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,250,000 as proposed by the House. This action includes approval of \$350,000 for completion of the pilot plant started during World War II at Laramie, Wyo., for research by the Bureau of Mines on the production of alumina from low-grade ores. The ores to be experimented with are different from bauxite ores found in other areas of the country. In approving this appropriation it is the intent of the conferees that, even though the experimental operations will not be financed from this appropriation, no research shall be conducted at this station on processes or methods, whether patented or not, unless all royalty and other valuable rights to developments or discoveries from such research accrue exclusively to the Government.

Amendment No. 89: Provides that not to exceed \$113,287 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

General administrative expenses

Amendment No. 90: Appropriates \$1,176,841 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,290,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 91: Provides that not to exceed \$1,018,434 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Management and protection

Amendment No. 92: Provides that not to exceed \$6,584,342 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities

Amendment No. 93: Appropriates \$7,369,790 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$7,300,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 94: Provides that not to exceed \$4,193,747 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Construction

Amendment No. 95: Appropriates \$11,370,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$11,975,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 96: Provides that not to exceed \$945,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

General administrative expenses

Amendment No. 97: Appropriates \$1,171,774 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,284,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 98: Provides that not to exceed \$1,014,538 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

*FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE**Management of resources*

Amendment No. 99: Appropriates \$6,678,196, instead of \$6,870,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,606,558 as proposed by the Senate. This action restores the amount of \$263,442 contained in the budget estimate for river basin studies except that the entire sum appropriated is to be subject to the reduction in funds to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 100: Provides that not to exceed \$4,259,363 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Investigations of resources

Amendment No. 101: Appropriates \$3,858,986 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,875,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 102: Provides that not to exceed \$2,487,629 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 103: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to prevent the use of this appropriation for investigations, surveys, and similar work in foreign countries.

Construction

Amendment No. 104: Appropriates \$733,742 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$750,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 105: Provides that not to exceed \$146,324 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

General administrative expenses

Amendment No. 106: Appropriates \$806,631 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$882,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 107: Provides that not to exceed \$678,319 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

Amendment No. 108—Administration of Territories: Reported in disagreement.

Alaska public works

Amendment No. 109: Appropriates \$7,000,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$8,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 110: Provides that not to exceed \$463,000 shall be available for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$500,000 for this purpose as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 111: Provides that not to exceed \$333,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Construction of roads, Alaska

Amendment No. 112: Provides for not to exceed \$2,493,000 shall be available for personal services, as provided by the Senate.

Operation and maintenance of roads, Alaska

Amendment No. 113: Appropriates \$2,900,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 114: Provides that not to exceed \$1,935,840 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Administrative provisions (Alaska Road Commission)

Amendment No. 115: Provides that not to exceed 20 percent of the construction appropriation be available for force account work as proposed by the Senate, instead of not to exceed 25 percent as proposed by the House.

Virgin Islands public works

Amendment No. 116: Appropriates \$592,970 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 117: Provides that not to exceed \$63,270 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 118: Inserts a proviso that no part of the appropriation shall be used for waterfront development work on St. Thomas and provides that the amount included in the 1952 budget estimates for such work be made available for school and hospital facilities, as proposed by the Senate.

Administration, Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 119: Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary: Appropriates \$2,154,911 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 120: Provides that not to exceed \$1,890,798 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Rescission of unused contract authority

Amendment No. 121: Strikes out the word "unused" and in lieu thereof inserts the word "unobligated", as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 122: Changes the effective date of the rescission from June 30, 1951, as proposed by the House, to June 30, 1952, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 123: Adopts the Senate proposal to strike out the words "except public works in the Virgin Islands".

Transfers of property—Office of Territories

Amendment No. 124: Reported in disagreement.

Virgin Islands Corporation

Amendment No. 125: Appropriates \$2,595,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,800,000 as proposed by the House.

*GENERAL PROVISIONS**Expenditures for informational and propaganda purposes*

Amendment No. 126: Strikes out the proposal of the House for limiting the use of funds for propaganda purposes, and adopts the proposal of the Senate to impose limitations upon expenditures for such purposes; but modifies the Senate proposal by adding at the end thereof a provision that the limitation shall not apply to the publication of reports and maps resulting from authorized scientific and engineering investigations and surveys or to photography incident to the compilation and reproduction of maps and reports or to photocopying of permanent records for preservation.

Limitation on employment of chauffeurs

Amendment No. 127: Adopts the amendment of the Senate limiting the employment of chauffeurs of Government-owned cars, but restricts its operation to the District of Columbia and excepts the automobile assigned to the Secretary and that assigned to the Under Secretary.

Employees engaged in personnel work

Amendment No. 128: Adopts the amendment of the Senate limiting the number of persons to be engaged in personnel work, but changes the proposed ratio of 1 such employee to 115 employees to 1 such employee to 110 employees.

Antistrike provision

Amendment No. 129: Reported in disagreement.

Expenditures during final quarter of fiscal year

Amendment No. 130: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to limit the expenditures for certain purposes during the last quarter of the fiscal year to not to exceed the average quarterly amount of such expenditures during the preceding three quarters of the fiscal year, except where the Director of the Bureau of the Budget authorizes otherwise. It is the intention of the conferees that excessive last-quarter purchases be prevented so that accumulated last-quarter balances revert to the Treasury.

Limitation on filling vacancies

Amendment No. 131: Strikes out the House provision limiting the filling of vacancies and the Senate proposal enumerating reduc-

tions already made in the various paragraphs throughout the bill, and inserts a modified proposal for limiting the filling of vacancies. Section (d) of the modified proposal enumerates several categories of essential employment which are exempted from the inhibition on filling vacancies. In order to obviate questions as to the scope of such exempt categories it is intended that the following sums be exempted with respect to each:

Health and safety.....	\$3,092,862
Law enforcement.....	630,835
Operation and maintenance.....	50,270,408
Soil and moisture.....	2,323,266
Forestry	1,976,379

Total.....\$58,293,750

It is intended that the exemptions not include supervisory, clerical, and related types of personnel, such as "white-collar" administrative personnel, not directly connected with the operation of any such specific field activity.

It is also intended that all savings effected pursuant to the modified restriction recommended with respect to filling vacancies are not to be expended for other purposes but that any such sums are to be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
FOSTER FURCOLO,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

(Mr. HALLECK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader as to the program for tomorrow?

Mr. MCCORMACK. The first order of business will be a veto message, after which we will call up the conference report on the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill and a conference report on the Department of the Interior appropriation bill. When those matters are disposed of there will be a continuation of the consideration of this bill which will continue through Friday and Saturday until disposed of. If the bill is acted on tomorrow, of course we will go over until Monday.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. What is the program for next week?

Mr. MCCORMACK. That will be announced tomorrow. It is not because I do not want to answer the question, I want that in the Record, but neither the majority whip nor myself are prepared to make the announcement.

CREATION OF A SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 390, Rept. No. 885), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation

NOT VOTING—70

Abblitt	Elston	Morton
Albert	Engle	Murray, Wis.
Allen, La.	Fisher	O'Konski
Andresen,	Gordon	Preston
August H.	Gore	Rivers
Baring	Granahan	Sabath
Boggs, La.	Hall	Sadlak
Bolling	Edwin Arthur	Saylor
Breen	Hays, Ohio	Scott,
Brehm	Hébert	Hugh D. Jr.
Buckley	Hedrick	Shelley
Buffett	Hess	Smith, Kans.
Busbey	Hinshaw	Stockman
Chatham	Howell	Taber
Chenoweth	Irving	Talle
Cole, Kans.	Jenison	Thomas
Cole, N. Y.	Kearns	Van Felt
Colmer	Lucas	Vinson
Coudert	McDonough	Welch
Cox	McGregor	Werdel
Davis, Tenn.	Martin, Mass.	Wheeler
DeGraffenried	Mason	Whitaker
Durham	Meador	Wood, Ga.
Ellsworth	Morrison	Wood, Idaho

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hess and Mr. Howell for, with Mr. Coudert against.

Mr. McGregor and Mr. Talle for, with Mr. Wood of Idaho against.

Mr. McDonough and Mr. Elston for, with Mr. Bolling against.

Until further notice:

Mr. DeGraffenried with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Preston with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Cole of Kansas.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Albert with Mr. Jenison.
Mr. Gordon with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Hedrick with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Busbey.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Van Felt.
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Wood of Georgia with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Brehm.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Buffett.
Mr. Engle with Mr. Meador.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Abblitt with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. SIEMINSKI, Mr. HOLIFIELD, and Mr. ANDONIZIO changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 5215) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 890), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH reserved all points of order on the bill.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. NORRELL (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this statement has been printed in the Record twice and is a resubmission of a report we have had heretofore, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

Mr. COOLEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, may I inquire of the gentleman from Arkansas if the House will have an opportunity to vote on the item which authorizes an investigation and a survey of the power situation at Buggs Island in North Carolina?

Mr. NORRELL. Yes. It is reported in disagreement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 16, 1951.)

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we submitted this conference report some 2 weeks ago. At that time there was a deep and concerned division of opinion regarding the so-called Ferguson amendment of the other body and the Jensen amendment of the House. So, at the instruction of the House, we went back to conference. I am glad to report to you today that the committee is submitting a conference report that has been signed without exception by all members of the conference committee of the House and of the other body, except the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] who is out of town, but including the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] to whom I shall yield shortly.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have given consideration to the general outline followed in the independent offices appropriation bill, which has been agreed to, making, of course, some exceptions which necessarily had to be made, and which the gentleman from Iowa understands thoroughly.

Regarding the other features of the report, I would like to say we considered in connection with this bill a total budget estimate of \$559,286,000. The House allowed, when we passed the bill originally, \$496,764,500. The other body passed the bill allowing a total amount of \$518,065,353. The conference report, I believe, would provide for a total in agree-

ment of \$511,523,316. In addition to this we will move to insert \$700,000 and \$318,500 in connection with amendments in disagreement, and, if approved, this will make a final total of \$511,841,816. We make one rescission regarding the transmission line which was originally authorized and appropriated for late last year from Buggs Island to Langley Field, the rescission being approximately \$1,750,000, that will not be needed and a wheeling contract may be entered into between the Government and the private utilities in that area.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up the time of the House further and now yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], has just explained a number of the essential points in this conference report.

I will not say that I am in complete agreement, as is my colleague of the minority side, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], as to all compromises reached by the conferees. Generally speaking, this is a good bill with a few exceptions which I did not agree to in committee, I am pleased to say that a fair compromise was reached in relation to the Jensen amendment. I signed the conference report due to the fact that we were in agreement on most items in the bill.

There is a little matter I feel I should mention at this time, and that is the position which the Congress has taken in respect to the building of transmission lines throughout the Nation.

Congress has set out a power policy which is very clear and concise; which in effect is that where either a private utility, the REA, municipal power, or a combination of any two of them or all of them combined are able, ready, and willing to build necessary transmission lines to wheel power from Federal hydro dams to preferred customers as set out in basic law at reasonable rates, shall be permitted to do so, instead of appropriating the taxpayers' money to build such unnecessary lines.

We have had some difficulty, for instance, in the Southwest Power Administration area. It seems that irrespective of what the Congress has directed, the administrator appears reluctant to obey or adhere to it. We have had that trouble in other areas in bygone days, but I am glad to say that the differences have been resolved and all concerned are now working in harmony to a very fine degree to the benefit of the power users. But I do want it to be known that the Congress has established the very definite power policy which I have just stated; and the Congress expects all Government employees to live up to that policy.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. The Administrator is not living up to the clear intent of the Congress. My amendment which passed by an overwhelming vote here has been stricken by the conferees. It would have prohibited the expenditure of money for

the construction of certain parallel lines in southwest Missouri. It is the policy, I think, of the Congress that these lines should not be built until the Administrator makes a sincere, serious, and earnest effort to negotiate contracts with private companies in order to wheel this power.

I want to say to the gentleman and this House that although Southwest Power has negotiated contracts in Texas and Oklahoma they stubbornly refuse to negotiate a contract with the Empire District Electric Co. at Joplin in southwest Missouri that is ready, willing, and able to supply this power. You ought to spank the Administrator and tell Mr. Douglas Wright where to head in.

Mr. JENSEN. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention, nor do I know that any Member has any intention, of offering an amendment to this report with regard to the Southwest Power problem. But I felt obligated to speak about it today here on the floor of the House of Representatives of the United States of America for the purpose of letting all Government employees know that Congress is still the law-making body of this Nation, that we want to give everybody a square deal, and that we expect the people who work for the Government to adhere to the directives of the elected representatives of the people.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. But, of course, these bureaucrats, drunk with power and hungry for more, ignore the Congress—have become bigger than the Congress of the United States.

I am not asking any favors for my district; all I am asking is equal treatment; all I want is justice. I am not only going to ask it—in fact, I am going to demand it and fight for it; and I think that the members of your committee, or you, can solve the problem yourselves, you and the Senators over there. If you speak to Mr. Wright in no uncertain terms, perhaps he will heed the admonition.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would like to get an over-all picture of this appropriation bill. As it passed the House it carried \$498,000,000 in round figures; the other body raised that to \$526,000,000 in round figures; the conferees reduced it to \$511,000,000 in round figures. Is that the true picture of this appropriation bill?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; in round numbers.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. What was the budget estimate?

Mr. NORRELL. I stated that a while ago, but, if the gentleman from Iowa will yield, I will restate it for the benefit of the gentleman from Virginia. The total budget estimate considered by the House was \$559,286,000. As reported by the House committee, the bill contained \$520,031,500; then, as passed by the House, it contained \$496,765,500; as passed by the Senate, it contained \$518,065,350; then, as agreed to by the conferees, the total amount is \$511,865,336.

Of course, there is involved in that the sum of \$750,000.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

(Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, there are 3,600 farm families in Missouri whose hope of having electric service and modern living conditions depend on the decision made on this amendment. I hardly think they would be willing to have the power policy of the Congress or of the United States determined by the remarks of someone here on the floor this afternoon who would condemn them to darkness and drudgery for the rest of their earthly life. What has been termed "unnecessary" and "duplicating" transmission lines here today are as a matter of fact all the lines the Government proposes in order to transmit power from hydro dams built with public money to the farmers, the REA cooperatives, the municipally owned electric systems, the public bodies generally.

This so-called wheeling policy may well be viewed with a high degree of suspicion by those who are looking to Congress for emancipation from serfdom and peonage in rural America and those who represent them here on the floor. The Congress certainly has not established any policy, definite or otherwise, to put the customers who are by law entitled to preference in purchasing power and energy from flood-control dams at the mercy of private monopolies. These private power companies and their spokesmen are trying to bore in with what they have come to call a wheeling policy. Actually, this is nothing but a policy to force the Government to let such private companies decide how Government power shall be transmitted, over whose lines it shall move, and ultimately who shall be able to buy it and at what rates.

The power policy of the Congress has been written into the law of the land. It is set forth in the reclamation law; it is in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, the Bonneville Power Act, the Rural Electrification Act, section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, and other such statutes.

This statutory policy is not to be considered as changed by repeated, concerned, and patent efforts to alter it with speeches in Congress or elsewhere.

If contracts can be negotiated for using transmission lines of other Government agencies, of REA cooperatives, or of privately owned electric companies, thereby avoiding construction of lines by the Southwestern Power Administration, or by other Government agencies in other areas, that may be well and good, provided—and this is the important part—provided that all the emphasis is upon getting power to the customers preferred under the law at the lowest possible rates. The advocates of a mandatory "wheeling" policy do not emphasize those points, and it is obvious that they have in mind no such emphasis or results or objectives.

It is too clear and too well established by law and practice to be altered or amended by speech-making or adroit phrases that the power policy of the United States Government and the Congress is to get publicly generated power to the customers preferred by the law, to get it to them without delays, to get it to them in adequate volume for their needs and without burdensome restrictions on its use, and to get it to them at the cheapest possible rates consistent with self-liquidation of the Government's investment in power facilities.

Let the Administrator of the Southwest Power Administration, Douglas Wright, who was referred to a moment ago, the Secretary of the Interior, and all others in positions of responsibility relating to public power follow that policy and this so-called "wheeling" business will take care of itself.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senate amendments which are reported in disagreement be considered en bloc: Nos. 53, 61, 62, 63, 72, 75, 108 and 129.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Senate amendment No. 53: Page 17, line 24, after the word "appropriation", insert "or other tribal funds."

Senate amendment No. 61: Page 20, line 1, strike out "Provided" and the balance of the line, also lines 2 to 5 and insert the following: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities for which the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer."

Senate amendment No. 62: Page 20, line 17, insert "Provided further, That in order to promote agreement among the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado, and to avoid any possible alteration of existing vested water rights, no part of this or of any prior appropriation shall be used for construction or for further commitment for construction of the Glendo unit or any feature thereof, until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado, and approved by Congress."

Senate amendment No. 63: Page 20, line 24, insert "Provided further, That no part of this or prior appropriations shall be used for construction nor for further commitments to construction of Moorhead Dam and Reservoir, Montana, or any feature thereof until a definite plan report thereon has been com-

pleted, reviewed by the States of Wyoming and Montana, and approved by the Congress."

Senate amendment No. 72: Page 23, line 1, insert:

"TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FACILITIES, FORT PECK PROJECT, MONTANA

"The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to transfer to the Department of the Interior without exchange of funds, all of the right, title, and interest of the Department of the Army in and to the following facilities, including rights-of-way (except that portion of the rights-of-way within the Fort Peck Reservoir area), but there shall be reserved the right to use the power facilities for the purpose of transmitting power to the Fort Peck project during emergency periods when the Fort Peck power plant is not functioning: (a) the Fort Peck-Rainbow (Great Falls) 161 kilovolt transmission line; (b) the Rainbow (Great Falls) terminal facilities; and (c) the Fort Peck-Whately 50 kilovolt transmission line and substation."

Senate amendment No. 75: Page 25, line 3, strike out "as authorized by law" and insert "and investigation and recovery of archeological and paleontological remains in such areas in the same manner as provided for in the act of August 21, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 461-467)."

Senate amendment No. 108: Page 38, strike out lines 3 to 6, inclusive, and insert the following:

"For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including expenses of the offices of the Governors of Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, as authorized by law (48 U. S. C., secs. 61, 531, 1422, 1431a (c)), expenses of the Government of the Virgin Islands including the agricultural station, as authorized by law (48 U. S. C. 1405, 7 U. S. C. 386g), and expenses of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands appointed pursuant to the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress; compensation and mileage of members of the legislatures in Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and American Samoa as authorized by law (48 U. S. C., secs. 87, 599, 1421d (e), and 1431a (c)); compensation and expenses of the judiciary in American Samoa as authorized by law (48 U. S. C. 1431a (c)) and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress; care of insane as authorized by law for Alaska (48 U. S. C. 46-50); grants to the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, in addition to current local revenues, for support of governmental functions; and not to exceed \$50,000 for personal services, household equipment and furnishings, and utilities necessary in the operation of the several Governors' houses; \$7,020,000, of which not to exceed \$811,865 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That the Territorial and local governments of the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands are authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That appropriations available for the administration of Territories, including the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, may be expended for the purchase, maintenance, and operation of not to exceed four aircraft, one AK and six AKL type surface vessels, and such minor vessels as may be required, for official purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found by the Secretary to be necessary in carrying out the provisions of article 6 (2) of the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress."

Senate amendment No. 129: Page 49, line 3, insert the following:

"Sec. 304. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence, and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That in cases of emergency, caused by fire, flood, storm, act of God, or sabotage, persons may be employed for periods of not more than 30 days and be paid salaries and wages without the necessity of inquiring into their membership in any organization."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the following amendments of the Senate and concur therein: Amendments Nos. 53, 61, 62, 63, 72, 75, 108, and 129.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 2, line 5, insert "Construction, Southeastern Power Administration."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 2, line 7, insert:

"For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825a), as applied to the southeastern power area, to remain available until expended, \$342,020."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: "In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert '\$318,500.'"

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, this motion puts in funds only for the construction of a line from Clark Hill Dam to Greenwood, S. C. It leaves out the money put in by the Senate for a survey from Buggs Island Dam to Kingston, N. C.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. It removes any provision or any funds for either survey or construction of the line from Buggs Island?

Mr. NORRELL. It does.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, in the year 1933 a great engineer, Mr. Dan T. Duncan, surveyed the site and conceived the idea of building a dam and hydroelectric project on the Saluda River near Ninety Six, S. C., in Greenwood County. This idea appealed to the leading citizens of Greenwood County. On November 16, 1933, Greenwood County applied to the Public Works Administration for a loan and grant to construct this hydroelectric system. It was approved June 19, 1934.

Duke Power Co., however, filed an injunction in the Federal court against the construction of this dam in November 1934. From that time until January 1938, Duke Power Co. prevented the construction of this dam. The case was fought through the district court, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals and finally reached the Supreme Court of the United States. That Court ruled in favor of the Federal Government's constitutional right to make this loan and grant to construct the dam in Greenwood County.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say to the Republican Members of this House that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court at that time was one of your great leaders, Charles Evans Hughes. Some other famous members of that renowned Court were Vandevanter, Brandeis and Harlan F. Stone. Greenwood County was ably represented during this period of litigation by the Honorable Jerome Frank, the present Justice of the Supreme Court Stanley Reed, State Senator W. H. Nicholson, from Greenwood County, and the late E. I. Davis.

Had Greenwood County been permitted to go ahead and begin the construction of this dam when it was first approved in 1934, we would have saved from \$500,000 to \$1,000,000. When construction was finally begun, in 1938, all construction costs had risen considerably since 1934.

The Greenwood system began operation during August 1940 and has furnished power for the rural areas of Greenwood, Laurens, Newberry and Ab-

beville Counties. Greenwood, Laurens, Ninety Six and Abbeville municipalities also have received power from the system. REA's municipals and industry saved approximately 20 percent when they started using Greenwood County power. Over a 10-year period this has meant a saving of approximately \$500,000 in power bills to the people of that area. Duke Power Co. also decreased its rates in 1938 and 1939, during the period of the construction of this dam, and made this savings to the people much more pronounced.

At the very beginning, or during August 1938, Greenwood County requested terms and conditions under which Duke Power Co. would sell Greenwood County a 10,000-kilowatt stand-by connection and received a reply that a service of this character was not furnished. Two years later, in May 1940, Greenwood attempted to make arrangements with Duke to use their existing facilities between Newberry, Parr Choals, and Lake Murray for interchange of power and to avoid a duplication of existing lines. Duke's answer to this was: "Our transmission facilities were constructed, and are operated, solely for the purpose of meeting the demands of our system in transmission of our power from the points of generation to the points of consumption." Times have certainly changed. In 1951, Duke's officials appeared before the House Appropriations Subcommittee and offered to transmit power to Greenwood from Clark Hill over a line they would construct without even approaching Greenwood County representatives.

Back during 1947, Greenwood tried to get a connection with Duke to relieve a serious power shortage in the Abbeville area. Duke claimed a shortage of generation on their system so Greenwood made arrangements with South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. for the generation of this power. Duke could not deliver this power due to overloading of their transformers. Abbeville Mills was forced to search the Nation for transformers and finally made arrangements with the War Department for transformers in Huntsville, Ala. Two of these transformers were shipped from Alabama to South Carolina but were never used and Duke's existing transformers furnished this power very easily. The amount of power involved was 3,000 to 3,500 kilowatts.

Greenwood County has been forced to operate as an isolated system without the advantages of an interconnection with a utility. The Greenwood Power Commission, which is the managing board, has been interested in Clark Hill since its inception and filed its application for Clark Hill power with the Secretary of Interior January 14, 1948. On April 20, 1951, the commission entered into a contract with the Southeastern Power Administration. This contract was approved by the Secretary of Interior May 16, 1951. In this contract the Government agreed to deliver power and energy to the commission at a substation constructed by the Government in the vicinity of Greenwood, S. C.

The Commission, having been assured of Clark Hill power and energy, set aside its steam plant and transmission expansion program. We have relied on the

Government carrying out its contract and are still depending on the Government to fulfill its contract for the delivery of power. Failure of the Government to fulfill this contract with Greenwood County will cost Greenwood thousands of dollars if it has to start on a program today which otherwise would have been started over a year ago. The problem of power supply is a long-range program with generating equipment deliveries running 3 years after an order is placed. If Greenwood had not been assured that the Government was going to build a line to Greenwood, it is needless to say that Greenwood would have most of the materials for a line to Clark Hill purchased and today would have a definite construction program underway.

The fact that Duke Power Co. officials offered to build a line to Clark Hill when they appeared before the House Appropriations Subcommittee is evidence enough that the line will not be a duplication. Today there is a load of 50,000 kilowatts in the Greenwood area. Greenwood's contract for 5,000 kilowatts is misleading unless the contract is fully understood. Greenwood has the right to increase this amount and will have an initial installation which will transmit 30,000 kilowatts of power to the area. Add to this the interchange benefits and it is easily understood that the people of Greenwood will have for the first time what they have been unable to get from Duke Power Co. the past 12 years.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the entire length of the transmission line is entirely within the district it is my honor to represent. This line will pass near my home at Route 1, Greenwood, S. C. I would like to say to the gentlemen of this House that I would not fight some project in your district which the people in your district desired and needed. I have not worked in this House for the construction of lines in your district when you wanted them eliminated. I am only asking similar treatment for the people of my district who need this connecting link with the great dam at Clark Hill.

Gentlemen of the House, let me digress at this point to say that I am proud of my little part in the fight for Clark Hill. It will mean much to the people of South Carolina and Georgia. It will contribute greatly to our national defense effort. Let me say here that the people in the Savannah River Valley shall ever be grateful to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable PAUL BROWN, for his great part in the winning battle for Clark Hill. Having been on the scene at that time, I attribute the successful fight for that great project more to PAUL BROWN, of Georgia, than any other American. Mr. Brown is with me in this fight to protect the interests of the people who cannot protect themselves in any other way than through their duly elected Representatives. I wish to thank this fine committee and these conferees for seeing fit to honor the Southeastern Power Administration's contract with the Greenwood Power Commission. They have kept the faith and have upheld the people's confidence in their Government.

Mr. Speaker, I would be derelict in my responsibility to this occasion if I did not pay tribute to the members of the Greenwood Power Commission. I am proud of my part in bringing the Greenwood Power Commission into being. I was a member of the State legislature that created this commission. I have not been disappointed in their discharge of duty. They have been a tribute to local government and the people's ability to manage their own affairs at the local level. I had a part in naming the present membership of that commission. They are men who believe in free enterprise, who believe in individual Americanism. They believe that one of the best ways to fight socialism and communism is to give the common people a chance; to give them reasonable power rates so that they can maintain themselves and their families on the old homesteads. Such projects as the Greenwood hydroelectric system have encouraged our farmers to remain on the land where they are independent, self-reliant, and the very opposite of socialism. False prophets cry out that this transmission line is a socialistic trend. The opposite is true. This will help the farmers, municipalities, and little industries of Greenwood, Laurens, Abbeville, and Newberry Counties have power at rates that will help keep them free and independent.

Mr. Speaker, if I were an artist or a cartoonist today I could take you back to the times when the children of rural Greenwood County were studying their lessons by the light of a smoky kerosene lamp or by the dim light of a candle or a pine knot in the fireplace. I remind you today that in rural America, before REA, there were no deep freezers, no refrigerators, no electric milking machines, no poultry houses lighted up at night, no electric pumps in the wells and no electricity generally on the average American farm. Imagine during the present heat wave in Texas, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina, the health hazard of no fresh milk for the little children of the deep South and the Middle West.

Before the coming of REA only a small percentage of my rural farmers had electricity. Now 95 percent of the rural people in Greenwood County have electricity at reasonable rates. All I am asking this morning is that this House allow the Government to keep the faith of its contract with the Greenwood Power Commission. I hope the House will adopt this amendment and this conference report which will greatly benefit the people in my home district in the great State of South Carolina.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 2, line 13, insert the following: "The sum of \$1,758,400, the unobligated portion of the \$1,850,000 appropriation contained in chapter V of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act,

1951 (Public Law 911, 81st Cong.), under the heading "Department of the Interior, South-eastern Power Administration, Construction", is hereby rescinded and shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this act."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"The unobligated portion of the \$1,850,000 appropriation contained in chapter V of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 911, 81st Cong.), under the heading 'Department of the Interior, South-eastern Power Administration, Construction', is hereby rescinded and shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this act."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 3, line 25, after "area", insert ": *Provided*, That the following paragraph under the heading 'Office of the Secretary, Continuing Fund, Power Transmission Facilities', in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950 (Public Law 350, 81st Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"CONTINUING FUND

"Continuing Fund, Power Transmission Facilities: All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy under the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), generated or purchased in the southwestern power area, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, except that the Treasury shall set up and maintain from such receipts a continuing fund of \$300,000, including the sum of \$100,000 in the continuing fund established under the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944 (57 Stat. 621), which shall be transferred to the fund hereby established: and said fund of \$300,000 shall be placed to the credit of the Secretary and shall be subject to check by him to defray emergency expenses necessary to insure continuity of electric service and continuous operation of the facilities."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided*, That the paragraph under the heading 'Office of the Secretary, Continuing Fund, Power Transmission Facilities,' in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950 (Public Law 350, 81st Cong.), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof, before the final period: '*Provided*, That expenditures from this fund to cover such costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy and rentals for the use of facilities are to be made only in such amounts as may be approved annually in appropriation acts and for the fiscal year

1952 such expenditures may be made not in excess of \$250,000'."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10½: Page 5, line 9, after "granted", insert ": *Provided*, That \$250,000 of the amount appropriated herein shall be available for purchase of electric power and energy and for leasing of transmission lines and related facilities of others."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 6, line 1, insert:

"TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FACILITIES, DENISON DAM PROJECT

"The jurisdiction and control of the Denison-Payne 132-kilovolt transmission line is hereby vested in the Secretary of the Interior, and the interdepartmental accounts shall be adjusted accordingly."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: At the end of the last line thereof, before the final period, insert "without transfer of funds."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24: Page 9, line 1, insert:

"CONSTRUCTION

"For construction of access roads on the re-vested Oregon & California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands; acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads adjacent to such lands; to remain available until expended, \$995,000, of which not to exceed \$45,000 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated herein for road construction shall be transferred to the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "\$995,000" named in said amendment insert "\$700,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 40: On page 14, line 8, after "reservations", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for construction or repair of the Tongue River Indian Reservation electric line, Montana, but the Secretary is hereby authorized

to enter into a reimbursable contract with the Tongue River Electric Cooperative, Inc., Montana, with respect to maintenance, operation, and subsequent transfer of ownership of said line."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: At the end of the last line thereof insert "and the Bureau of Indian Affairs may accept payment for such line in the form of credit on electric bills."

(Mr. D'Ewart asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. D'Ewart addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 57: Page 19, line 16, after "facilities", insert the following: "and including a payment to the Grand Coulee School District, Washington, for school facilities, proportionate to the payment made to the Coulee Dam District, Washington, in fiscal 1951, based on relative enrollment of dependents of Bureau of Reclamation and contractor employees."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "and including a final payment of not to exceed \$282,275 to the Grand Coulee School District, Washington, to be made for school facilities, in accordance with the agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Grand Coulee School District, based on enrollment of dependents of Bureau of Reclamation and contractor employees, such payment to constitute full and final discharge of all Federal responsibility arising out of enrollment of dependents of employees of the Bureau of Reclamation and its contractors."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 83: Page 27, line 14, after "United States", insert the following: "shall be repayable by said district to the United States unless said district shall be judicially determined to be not liable therefor."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "shall be repayable by said district to the United States unless said district shall be judicially determined by a court of competent jurisdiction to be not liable therefor."

The motion was agreed to.
The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 124: On page 45, line 6, insert the following:

"Sec. 109. Transfers to the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 of property, other than real, excess to the needs of Federal agencies may be made at the request of the Secretary without reimbursement or transfer of funds when required by the Department for operations conducted in the Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Sec. 109. Transfers to the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 of property, other than real, excess to the needs of the Navy Department may be made during the current fiscal year at the request of the Secretary of the Interior without reimbursement or transfer of funds when required by the Interior Department for operations conducted in the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and American Samoa."

[Mr. TACKETT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record at that point where amendment No. 4 was under discussion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. Some of us want to be heard on this and we have not been treated fairly.

Mr. NORRELL. Why, I would be glad to yield time to the gentleman. May I say, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has not made any request of me for time at all.

Mr. RANKIN. I certainly have been standing here all the time seeking recognition.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

(Mr. ARMSTRONG and Mr. TACKETT asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 16, 1951.)

Mr. WHITTEN (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conferees have agreed with the Senate on all matters with one exception which is brought back here in actual disagreement.

The House bill carried approximately \$717,000,000. The Senate had to add to that in view of the fact of the International Wheat Agreement coming up, but on a comparative figure the Senate figures amounted to approximately \$750,000,000. The conference report agrees to approximately \$725,000,000 which, on a comparative basis, as I have stated, is about \$8,000,000 more than the bill which passed the House and about \$25,000,000 less than that as it passed the Senate to which, of course, must be added the funds for the International Wheat Agreement.

I call attention to the fact that as the bill passed the House it was less than 50 percent of what the appropriation was for 1940. Your conference committee and the Committee on Appropriations have consistently reduced these appropriations.

We have reached some compromise with regard to the PMA program. In this report we have authorized a program for next year of \$256,500,000 which is about \$23,500,000 below the Senate figure, although somewhat higher than the House figure. We provide in appropriations \$260,000,000 which is \$20,000,000 below the Senate figures.

We have tried to provide for range improvements by language which in effect is to pay for such from receipts

We have seen to it that with certain listed exceptions, 10 percent of all the money set out in the bill for personnel is no longer available. We have retained the features of the Jensen amendment as it was originally written, with the further provision, which, in my judgment, makes it workable. That is, within the 90 percent that is available they can shift personnel around within the department so as to actually meet its need within the personnel available.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion to inform the House that the gentleman from Mississippi has been very helpful in working out a good compromise on the Jensen-Ferguson proposition.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi a question for the purpose of the Record. I refer to that part of the report having to do with the Parma, Idaho, onion research item, which is a very small item, but I notice that the words "Parma, Utah," are not in the report. It is my understanding that it is the intention of the conferees that that particular item of \$9,000 be expended at that particular station; is that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct. We thought that making an especial allowance to special locations is not good practice, but since this work is centered there it is intended to be spent there. It was thoroughly understood that is where the money would be expended.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. One further comment. I was very much pleased that the conferees agreed to my suggestion that we recede to the Senate position on amendments numbered 51 and 52, which affect largely research and technical assistance given to farmers' cooperatives. As the House will recall at the time the bill was up on the floor for consideration, I stated that in my opinion, we on the House side made an unwise cut in that particular item; in fact, we sliced it by about 40 percent. This restoration of \$100,000 by the Senate, to which the House conferees agreed at my urging, will enable the worthwhile projects in cooperative research to be carried out.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Will the gentleman tell us what the conference agreed on with respect to amendment No. 30?

Mr. WHITTEN. In effect what we tried to do was to say that the money is available for this purpose, but it amounts to making it available from receipts in that enough of the receipts that would otherwise be due to the counties and States would be retained to pay their fourth. So it amounts to carrying on the policy which the Department has done in the past without authority. Now, that was my own position in that matter and we have tried to work it out where the Department can carry on the work with the local areas meeting one-fourth of the cost from receipts due such area.

Mr. GRANGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified to note that the committee of conference on this bill has accepted the items inserted by the Senate Committee on Appropriations dealing with research on diseases and insect pests affecting wheat. I am referring particularly to

just as any other Senator or any minority group can do—yet he must accept responsibility for what he says. I am certain that the able Senator from Connecticut intends to accept the responsibility for the many, many mistakes, the many inaccuracies he has made in his individual views, and the fact that in writing them he was trying to criticize the minority views and call them a political document when any fair-minded man who will read his statement and does not come to the conclusion that it is political, certainly does not understand the English language.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1952—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report see proceedings of the House of Representatives of August 16, 1951, pp. 10405-10408.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3790, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.
August 17, 1951.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 53, 61, 62, 63, 72, 75, 108, and 129 to the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$318,500."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"The unobligated portion of the \$1,850,000 appropriation contained in chapter V of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 911, 81st Cong.), under the heading 'Department of the Interior, Southeastern Power Administration, Construction,' is hereby rescinded and shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this act."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "Provided, That the paragraph under the heading 'Office of the Secretary, continuing fund, power transmission facilities,' in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950 (Public

Law 350, 81st Cong.), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof, before the final period, 'Provided, That expenditures from this fund to cover such costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy and rentals for the use of facilities are to be made only in such amounts as may be approved annually in appropriation acts and for the fiscal year 1952 such expenditures may be made not in excess of \$250,000.'"

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: At the end of the last line thereof, before the final period, insert "without transfer of funds."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of \$995,000 named in said amendment, insert "\$700,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: At the end of the last line thereof insert "and the Bureau of Indian Affairs may accept payment for such line in the form of credit on electric bills."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "and including a final payment of not to exceed \$282,275 to the Grand Coulee School District, Washington, to be made for school facilities, in accordance with the agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Grand Coulee School District, based on enrollment of dependents of Bureau of Reclamation and contractor employees, such payment to constitute full and final discharge of all Federal responsibility arising out of enrollment of dependents of employees of the Bureau of Reclamation and its contractors."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "shall be repayable by said district to the United States unless said district shall be judicially determined by a court of competent jurisdiction to be not liable therefor."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 109. Transfers to the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 of property, other than real, excess to the needs of the Navy Department may be made during the current fiscal year at the request of the Secretary of the Interior without reimbursement or transfer of funds when required by the Interior Department for operations conducted in the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and American Samoa."

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10½ to said bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 8, 14, 24, 40, 57, 83, and 124.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 10½.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that disposes of the Interior Department Appropriation bill.

POLLUTION OF RAINY LAKE—CORRESPONDENCE AND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, because of the complaint that has come to us in Congress and also to State officials about the pollution of Rainy Lake on the border between the United States and Canada, I found it necessary on June 28, 1951, to address a letter to the Honorable Dean Acheson, Secretary of State. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a copy of my letter addressed to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson, and also the reply I received from his office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letters referred to are as follows:

JUNE 28, 1951.

HON. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am very much concerned over reports that have come to me from State officials of Minnesota and from various citizens regarding the pollution of Rainy Lake on the international boundary between the State of Minnesota and the Province of Ontario.

It appears that the contamination of this lake is due to the effluent flowing into the Seine River from mining operations at Steep Rock Lake, Ontario, and that the effect of the contamination of Rainy Lake is a serious menace to public health, to domestic and municipal water supply, to industrial use of the water, to fish life, and to the scenic beauty of the lake and the surrounding area.

These facts have all been presented to you in communications from the Honorable Luther W. Youngdahl, Governor of Minnesota, and Hon. Chester S. Wilson, State commissioner of conservation and chairman of the Minnesota Water Pollution Control Commission.

The situation is one which should be covered under the terms of the treaty of January 11, 1909, between the United States and Great Britain, concerning the boundary waters between the United States and Canada. It would appear, therefore, that the matter should properly be considered by the International Joint Commission in an effort to seek relief from the dangers and damages resulting from the pollution of Rainy Lake. I respectfully request that steps be taken to negotiate with the Government of Canada for an appropriate reference of this matter to the Joint International Commission and for adequate steps to bring about abatement of the cause of the contamination of Rainy Lake.

I am sure that our Government is concerned over this situation and that the Department of State will take immediate steps to originate the proper proceedings to bring about relief from this situation.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 3, 1951.

HON. EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR THYE: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter dated June 28, 1951 regarding complaints of State officials and various citizens of Minnesota concerning pollution of Rainy Lake on the international boundary between the State of Minnesota and the Province of Ontario by effluent flowing into the Seine River from mining operations at Steep Rock Lake, Ontario.

An appropriate instruction with regard to this matter has been forwarded to the American Embassy at Ottawa with a view to having an investigation made and if the facts are found to be as set forth in communications received from the State authorities, asking that steps be taken to terminate the pollution of Rainy Lake, which is in violation of article IV of the Boundary Waters Treaty of January 11, 1909. Upon receipt of a report from the Embassy, a further communication will be forwarded to you.

Sincerely yours,

JACK K. McFALL,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like also to have inserted in the body of the RECORD following my remarks a resolution adopted by the Minnesota Water Pollution Control Commission on the pollution of Rainy Lake from the Steep Rock mining operations; also a resolution adopted by the Minnesota Legislative Research Committee on the pollution of Rainy Lake from the Steep Rock mining operations.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MINNESOTA WATER POLLUTION CONTROL COMMISSION—RESOLUTION ON POLLUTION OF RAINY LAKE FROM STEEP ROCK MINING OPERATIONS

Whereas at a public hearing held jointly by the Minnesota Water Pollution Control Commission and the board of health of the Province of Ontario at Fort Frances, Ontario, on June 26, 1951, the following facts were conclusively established: (1) That the discharge of effluent from the hydraulic stripping operations at the iron mine at Steep Rock Lake, Ontario, into the Seine River and thence into Rainy Lake has caused extensive pollution of the waters of said lake on both sides of the international boundary, resulting in severe and lasting injury to public interests and private property pertaining to said lake in both the United States and Canada, as more particularly stated in communications addressed to the Secretary of State from the Governor of Minnesota, the chairman of this commission, and the commissioner of conservation of this State; (2) that the company operating said mine, Steep Rock Iron Mines, Ltd., has received ample warning of the injurious effects of said operations as aforesaid, but nevertheless persists in continuing the same, without lawful authority and in direct violation of the existing treaty between the United States and Great Britain respecting international boundary waters: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Minnesota Water Pollution Control Commission, That we urge the Secretary of State to call upon the Government of the Dominion of Canada to take action for immediate abatement of the cause of said pollution without further delay, in compliance with the provisions of said treaty; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of State, the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Minnesota, the Governor of Minnesota, the board of health of the Province of Ontario, and Steep Rock Iron Mines, Ltd., also to the press and radio for publication.

RESOLUTION BY THE MINNESOTA LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH COMMITTEE ON THE POLLUTION OF RAINY LAKE FROM STEEP ROCK MINING OPERATIONS

Whereas it has been definitely established that the discharge of effluent from hydraulic stripping operations at Steep Rock Lake, Ontario, into the Seine River and thence into

Rainy Lake has caused extensive pollution of waters of said lake on both sides of the international boundary; and

Whereas the effluent consists of finely divided silica, iron, and other mineral components suspended in water which does not settle readily; and

Whereas this effluent gives the water a pronounced brownish discoloration which varies in intensity according to the degree of dilution; and

Whereas the turbidity impairs the quality of the water for domestic and municipal water supply and industrial use; and

Whereas the turbidity has caused serious harm to private and commercial fishing operation; and

Whereas said turbidity is progressively destroying the scenic beauty of Rainy Lake which will curtail the tourist traffic on and around the lake, impairing the value of resort camps, homes, and other property bordering on the lake, and consequently have a depressing effect on employment, business and industry dependent upon such traffic; and

Whereas the management of the Steep Rock Iron Mines, Ltd., has received ample warning of the injurious effects of pollution as aforesaid but persists in continuing operation in direct violation of the existing treaty between the United States and Great Britain which provides (art. IV) that the boundary waters shall not be polluted on either side to the injury of health or property on the other; and

Whereas since present stripping operations will be completed within 2 or 3 years, continuing investigation, which defers action, is of no value whatsoever, and prompt action is necessary to prevent permanent and irreparable damage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State immediately call upon the Government of the Dominion of Canada to take action for immediate abatement of the causes of said pollution in compliance with the provisions of said treaty; be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Legislative Research Committee transmit copies of this resolution to the Secretary of State, Senators and Representatives from Minnesota in Congress, proper Canadian authorities, the Steep Rock Mines, Ltd., and to the press and radio for publication.

PROPOSED MISSOURI BASIN SURVEY COMMISSION

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the Nation's worst flood disaster which struck Missouri, Kansas, and Oklahoma with such devastating results last month has again brought to the fore the urgent need for positive action aimed at preventing, insofar as is humanly possible, the recurrence of another such catastrophe. So many of my colleagues in both the Senate and the House have actually visited the scene of the disaster, seen the motion picture which so graphically presented the stark and ugly effects of the ravaging waters, and read the newspaper accounts of the destruction, that I am sure there is full and complete understanding of the chaos which struck that large area. The speed with which both Houses of the Congress approved both the emergency disaster appropriation and the emergency-housing measure was, to me, vivid and moving demonstration of the sympathy and wholehearted generosity of the American people toward their fellow citizens in time of distress. I know that I speak for every individual and family in the area who suffered from this terrible flood when I express our deep and heartfelt gratitude for these prompt actions.

Now, more than a month after the flood struck, the people in the region are still digging out of the debris. But it is a long, slow, heartbreaking process. Some businesses, I understand, will not reopen, because they have no assurance that such a disaster will not strike them again. Thousands of homes have been completely destroyed and many others damaged beyond repair. Five million acres of growing crops and crops ready for market were wholly wiped out. Remarkable progress has been made in restoring airports, roads, communication, and rail transportation to normal operation. Although the full estimate of the damage is still unknown, it will undoubtedly be a staggering figure.

Aside from the human suffering in the flood area, the resulting paralysis of business, industry, and agriculture in such a large and productive section constituted a serious threat not only to the economy of that area, but to the economy of the entire country. As a Nation engaged in building up our defense efforts, we simply cannot afford this kind of economic dislocation and waste. We cannot afford to sit back and say, "Yes; it was terrible, but we are meeting the emergency needs somehow. The worst is over, and maybe it will not happen again for many years." That is merely indulging in wishful thinking when the situation cries out for constructive thought and action.

Planning a comprehensive water program for the vast Missouri Basin is a problem that has caused deep concern and worry for many, many years, but one that thus far has remained unsolved. Part of the area has too much water and much of it has too little water. Part of it has repeatedly suffered from violent and destructive floods and much of it has been stricken year after year by severe drought. As all of my colleagues know, there has been and still exists a wide division of respectable opinion as to the best methods and program which should be followed in order properly and effectively to meet the water-resources needs of the area. Floods and drought are but two of the difficult problems which must be solved. There are also the questions of irrigation, navigation, hydroelectric power, soil conservation, pollution abatement, wildlife, and many other related matters.

I have been deeply concerned, as I know all of us have, over the sectional biases and jurisdictional disputes and sharp controversies which have all operated to retard any real solution to the problem. The great volume of mail which has poured into my office—and I am sure into many other offices, particularly those of Senators from the great Missouri Valley—during and since the disaster has indicated to me that many sharply conflicting views as to what particular plans and programs are needed have been washed aside. The one plea which is repeated and multiplied until it becomes almost a single voice is, "We must have action. We must have some assurance. This must never happen again."

Mr. President, the people of this area have a right to expect and to demand such action. But as I have pointed out before, it is not only the people of the

M. L. P.

Public Law 136 - 82d Congress
Chapter 375 - 1st Session
H. R. 3790

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, namely:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

ENFORCEMENT OF CONNALLY HOT OIL ACT

For expenses necessary for controlling the interstate shipment of contraband oil as required by law (15 U. S. C. 715), including purchase of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, \$158,670, of which not to exceed \$137,970 shall be available for personal services.

CONSTRUCTION, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, to remain available until expended, \$318,500.

The unobligated portion of the \$1,850,000 appropriation contained in chapter V of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 911, Eighty-first Congress), under the heading "Department of the Interior, Southeastern Power Administration, Construction", is hereby rescinded and shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this Act.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, \$200,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations of the Southeastern Power Administration shall be available for purchase of not to exceed four passenger motor vehicles. Appropriations made herein to the Southeastern Power Administration shall be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for operation and maintenance shall be available only for the service of the current fiscal year.

CONTINUING FUND, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy under the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), generated or purchased in the southeastern power area, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, except that the Treasury

shall set up and maintain from such receipts a continuing fund of \$50,000, and said fund shall be placed to the credit of the Secretary, and shall be subject to check by him to defray emergency expenses necessary to insure continuity of electric service and continuous operation of Government facilities in said area: *Provided*, That the paragraph under the heading "Office of the Secretary, Continuing Fund, Power Transmission Facilities", in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950 (Public Law 350, Eighty-first Congress), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof, before the final period "*Provided*, That expenditures from this fund to cover such costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy and rentals for the use of facilities are to be made only in such amounts as may be approved annually in appropriation Acts and for the fiscal year 1952 such expenditures may be made not in excess of \$250,000".

CONSTRUCTION, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, to remain available until expended, \$3,375,000, of which not to exceed \$586,800 shall be available for personal services, and of which not to exceed \$600,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, \$1,255,712, of which not to exceed \$900,712 shall be available for personal services.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FACILITIES, DENISON DAM PROJECT

The jurisdiction and control of the Denison-Payne 132-kilovolt transmission line is hereby vested in the Secretary of the Interior, and the interdepartmental accounts shall be adjusted accordingly without transfer of funds.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations of the Southwestern Power Administration shall be available for purchase of not to exceed eight passenger motor vehicles for replacement only. Appropriations made herein to the Southwestern Power Administration shall be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for operation and maintenance shall be available only for the service of the current fiscal year.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses made necessary by the Act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts (40 U. S. C. 104), including payment of actual traveling expenses of the members and secretary of the Commission in attending meetings and committee meetings of the Commission either within or outside the District of Columbia, to be disbursed on vouchers approved by the Commission, \$20,000.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, \$67,500,000, of which not to exceed \$8,387,470 shall be available for personal services, except force account personal services, and of which not to exceed \$21,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system and of marketing electric power and energy, \$5,368,439, of which not to exceed \$3,983,862 shall be available for personal services.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed upon the Administrator pursuant to law, including not to exceed \$40,000 for services as authorized by Section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including such services at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem for individuals; purchase of not to exceed twelve passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and purchase (not to exceed two) of aircraft. Appropriations made herein to the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for operation and maintenance shall be available only for the service of the current fiscal year.

Not to exceed 12 per centum of the appropriation for construction herein made for the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available for construction work by force account or on a hired-labor basis, except in case of emergencies, local in character, so declared by the Bonneville Power Administrator.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and performance of other functions, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, \$7,722,605, of which not to exceed \$4,864,096 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That this appropriation may be expended on a reimbursable basis for surveys of lands other than those under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction of access roads on the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands; acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads adjacent to such lands; to remain available until expended, \$700,000, of which not to exceed \$45,000 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated herein for road construction shall be transferred to the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management shall be available for purchase of not to exceed twenty-nine passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and alteration and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities to which the United States has title: *Provided*, That of appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Land Management expenditures in connection with the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands shall be reimbursed from the 25 per centum referred to in section C, title II, of the Act approved August 28, 1937, of the special fund designated the "Oregon and California Land Grant Fund" and section 4 of the Act approved May 24, 1939, of the special fund designated the "Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant Fund".

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and 10 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C. 315), sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received, during the current fiscal year, as range improvement fees under section 3 of said Act and of 25 per centum of all moneys received, during the current fiscal year, under section 15 of said Act, to remain available until expended.

PAYMENTS TO STATES (PROCEEDS OF SALES)

For payment to the several States of 5 per centum of the net proceeds of sales of public lands and materials lying within their limits, for the purpose of education or of making public roads and improvements, sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received in accordance with section 4 of the Act of June 26, 1934 (31 U. S. C. 725c), during the current and succeeding fiscal years, and including in the fiscal year 1952 the unappropriated balance of receipts of prior fiscal years, to remain available until expended.

PAYMENT TO OKLAHOMA (ROYALTIES)

For payment to the State of Oklahoma in lieu of all State and local taxes upon tribal funds accruing under the provisions of the joint resolution of June 12, 1926 (44 Stat. 740), to be expended by the State in the same manner as if received under section 35 of the Act approved February 25, 1920 (30 U. S. C. 191), sums equal to 37½ per centum of the royalties received during the current and each succeeding fiscal year, from the south half of Red River in Oklahoma under the provisions of said joint resolution of June 12, 1926, to remain available until expended.

LEASING OF GRAZING LANDS

For leasing State, county, or privately owned lands in accordance with the provisions of the Act of June 23, 1938 (43 U. S. C. 315m-1), sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received during the current and each succeeding fiscal year, in accordance with the Act of June 23, 1938 (43 U. S. C. 315m-4), to remain available until expended.

PAYMENTS TO STATES (GRAZING FEES)

Sums not in excess of $33\frac{1}{3}$ per centum of all grazing fees received during the current and each succeeding fiscal year from each grazing district on Indian lands ceded to the United States for disposition under the public-land laws, to remain available until expended for payment to the State in which said lands are situated, in accordance with the provisions of section 11 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C. 315j).

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE SERVICES

For expenses necessary to provide health, education, and welfare services for Indians, either directly or in cooperation with States and other organizations, including payment (in advance or from date of admission) of care, tuition, assistance, and other expenses of Indians in boarding homes, institutions, or schools; grants and other assistance to needy Indians; maintenance of law and order, and payment of rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of law on Indian reservations or lands; and operation of Indian arts and crafts shops and museums; \$41,824,750, of which not to exceed \$23,699,661 shall be available for personal services.

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

For expenses necessary for management, development, improvement, and protection of resources and appurtenant facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including payment of irrigation assessments and charges; acquisition of water rights; conducting agricultural experiments and demonstrations; furnishing plants or seed to Indians; advances for Indian industrial and business enterprises; payment of expenses of Indian fairs, including premiums for exhibits; and development of Indian arts and crafts as authorized by law (25 U. S. C. 305), including expenses of exhibits; \$10,921,360, of which not to exceed \$6,843,485 shall be available for personal services.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, major repair, and improvement of irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, roads and trails, and other facilities; acquisition of lands and interests in lands; preparation of lands for farming; and architectural and engineering services by contract; to remain available until expended, \$10,000,000, of which not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be available for personal services, and of which not to exceed \$3,125,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted: *Provided*, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside or outside the boundaries of existing reservations: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for construction or repair of the Tongue River Indian Reservation electric line, Montana, but the Secretary is hereby authorized to enter into a reimbursable contract with the Tongue River Electric Cooperative, Incorporated,

Montana, with respect to maintenance, operation, and subsequent transfer of ownership of said line and the Bureau of Indian Affairs may accept payment for such line in the form of credit on electric bills.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the general administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including such expenses in field offices, \$3,300,747, of which not to exceed \$2,693,281 shall be available for personal services.

REVOLVING FUND FOR LOANS

For an additional amount for loans as authorized by sections 10 and 11 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U. S. C. 470, 471), as amended and supplemented, and section 1 of the Act of April 19, 1950 (Public Law 474), \$800,000.

PAYMENT TO CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW NATIONS OF INDIANS, OKLAHOMA

For an additional amount for "Payment to Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians, Oklahoma", for defraying the expenses of making per capita payments authorized by the Acts of June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 483), and June 24, 1948 (Public Law 754, Eightieth Congress), \$22,655, of which not to exceed \$21,105 shall be available for personal services.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except the revolving fund for loans) shall be available for purchase of not to exceed one hundred and sixty passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, which may be used for the transportation of Indians; purchase of ice for official use of employees; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including not to exceed \$5,000 for expenditure at rates for individuals not in excess of \$50 per diem on irrigation and power matters, when authorized by the Secretary; and expenses required by continuing or permanent treaty provisions.

CLAIMS AND TREATY OBLIGATIONS

For fulfilling treaties with Senecas and Six Nations of New York, Choctaws and Pawnees of Oklahoma, and payment to Indians of Sioux reservations, to be expended as provided by law, such amounts as may be necessary after June 30, 1951.

PROCEEDS FROM POWER

Sums not in excess of the amount of power revenues covered into the Treasury during the current and each succeeding fiscal year to the credit of each of the power projects, including revenues credited prior to August 7, 1946, to remain available until expended for the purposes authorized by section 3 of the Act of August 7, 1946, as amended (31 U. S. C. 725s-3), in connection with the respective projects from which such revenues are derived.

TRIBAL FUNDS

In addition to the tribal funds authorized to be expended by existing law, there is hereby appropriated \$2,109,000 from tribal funds not otherwise available for expenditure for the benefit of Indians and Indian tribes, including pay and travel expenses of employees; care, tuition and other assistance to Indian children attending public and private schools (which may be paid in advance or from date of admission); purchase of land and improvements on land, title to which shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the tribe for which purchased; lease of lands and water rights; compensation and expenses of attorneys and other persons employed by Indian tribes under approved contracts; pay, travel and other expenses of tribal officers, councils, and committees thereof, or other tribal organizations, including mileage for use of privately owned automobiles and per diem in lieu of subsistence at rates established administratively but not to exceed those applicable to civilian employees of the Government; relief of Indians, without regard to section 7 of the Act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 391), including cash grants; and employment of a recreational director for the Menominee Reservation and a curator for the Osage Museum, each of whom shall be appointed with the approval of the respective tribal councils and without regard to the classification laws: *Provided*, That in addition to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds may be advanced to Indian tribes during the current fiscal year for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of the particular tribe involved and approved by the Secretary: *Provided, however*, That no part of this appropriation or other tribal funds shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming, either inside or outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

For carrying out the functions of the Bureau of Reclamation as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) and other Acts applicable to that Bureau, as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans; engineering and economic investigations, as a basis for legislation, and for reports thereon to Congress, relating to projects for the development and utilization of the water resources of Alaska; formulating plans and preparing designs and specifications for authorized Federal reclamation projects or parts thereof prior to appropriations for construction of such projects or parts; and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing projects; to remain available until expended, \$4,500,000, of which not to exceed \$4,234,553 shall be available for personal services, and of which \$3,810,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and \$500,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River development fund: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any sums from this appropriation for investigations of any nature requested by States, municipalities, or other interests shall be upon the basis of the State, municipality, or other interest advancing at least 50 per centum of the estimated cost of such investigations: *Provided further*, That, except as herein expressly provided with

respect to investigations in Alaska, no part of this appropriation shall be expended in the conduct of activities which are not authorized by law.

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects or parts thereof (including power transmission facilities and including a final payment of not to exceed \$282,275 to the Grand Coulee School District, Washington, to be made for school facilities, in accordance with the agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Grand Coulee School District, based on enrollment of dependents of Bureau of Reclamation and contractor employees, such payment to constitute full and final discharge of all Federal responsibility arising out of enrollment of dependents of employees of the Bureau of Reclamation and its contractors) and for other related activities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, \$202,767,725, of which not to exceed \$38,104,672 shall be available for personal services, and of which \$28,972,650 shall be derived from the reclamation fund: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities for which the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer: *Provided further*, That in order to promote agreement among the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado, and to avoid any possible alteration of existing vested water rights, no part of this or of any prior appropriation shall be used for construction or for further commitment for construction of the Glendo unit or any feature thereof, until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado, and approved by Congress: *Provided further*, That no part of this or prior appropriations shall be used for construction, nor for further commitments to construction of Moorhead Dam and Reservoir, Montana, or any feature thereof until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of Wyoming and Montana, and approved by the Congress.

Of the amount appropriated under the preceding paragraph, \$1,000,000 is for partial liquidation of the contract authority granted under the appropriation "General fund, construction, Missouri River Basin", in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof and of other facilities, as authorized by law; and for a soil and moisture conservation program on lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant to law, \$15,977,594, of which \$12,476,494 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and \$1,671,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River dam fund, and of which not to exceed \$10,698,514 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That funds advanced for operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and may be expended for the same objects and in the same manner as sums appropriated herein may be expended, and the unexpended balances of such advances shall be credited to the appropriation for the next succeeding fiscal year.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of general administration and related functions in the offices of the Commissioner of Reclamation and in the regional offices of the Bureau of Reclamation, \$5,478,203, of which not to exceed \$4,696,178 shall be available for personal services, to be derived from the reclamation fund and to be nonreimbursable pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377) : *Provided*, That no part of any other appropriation in this Act shall be available for activities or functions budgeted for the current fiscal year as general administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That not exceeding \$150,000 of funds available for expenditure under this appropriation shall be used for salaries and expenses in connection with information work.

EMERGENCY FUND

For an additional amount for the emergency fund as authorized by the Act of June 26, 1948 (43 U. S. C. 502), \$400,000, to be derived from the Reclamation fund, special fund, and to remain available until expended for the purposes specified in said Act.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FACILITIES, FORT PECK PROJECT, MONTANA

The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to transfer to the Department of the Interior without exchange of funds, all of the right, title, and interest of the Department of the Army in and to the following facilities, including rights-of-way (except that portion of the rights-of-way within the Fort Peck Reservoir area), but there shall be reserved the right to use the power facilities for the purpose of transmitting power to the Fort Peck project during emergency periods when the Fort Peck power plant is not functioning: (a) the Fort Peck-Rainbow (Great Falls) 161 kilovolt transmission line; (b) the Rainbow (Great Falls) terminal facilities; and (c) the Fort Peck-Whatley 50 kilovolt transmission line and substation.

SPECIAL FUNDS

Sums herein referred to as being derived from the reclamation fund, the Colorado River dam fund, or the Colorado River development fund, are appropriated from the special funds in the Treasury created by the Act of June 17, 1902 (43 U. S. C. 391), the Act of December 21, 1928 (43 U. S. C. 617a), and the Act of July 19, 1940 (43 U. S. C. 618a), respectively. Such sums shall be transferred, upon request of the Secretary, to be merged with and expended under the heads herein specified; and the unexpended balances of sums transferred for expenditure under the heads "Operation and maintenance" and "General administrative expenses" shall revert and be credited to the special fund from which derived.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for purchase of not to exceed one hundred passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed \$50,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including such services at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per day, when authorized by the Secretary; payment of claims for damage to or loss of property, personal injury, or death arising out of activities of the Bureau of Reclamation; payment, except as otherwise provided for, of compensation and expense of persons on the

rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as authorized by law to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts without reimbursement or return under the reclamation laws; rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of law involving property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; performance of the functions specified under the head "Operation and Maintenance Administration", Bureau of Reclamation, in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1945; preparation and dissemination of useful information including recordings, photographs, and photographic prints; and studies of recreational uses of reservoir areas, and investigation and recovery of archeological and paleontological remains in such areas in the same manner as provided for in the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 461-467): *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377), for expenses other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects except "General Administrative Expenses" and amounts provided for reconnaissance, basin surveys, and general engineering and research under the head "General Investigations."

Allotments to the Missouri River Basin project from the appropriation under the head "Construction and rehabilitation" shall be available additionally for said project for those functions of the Bureau of Reclamation provided for under the head "General investigations" (but this authorization shall not preclude use of the appropriation under said head within that area), and for the continuation of investigations by agencies of the Department on a general plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin. Such allotments may be expended through or in cooperation with State and other Federal agencies, and advances to such agencies are hereby authorized.

Sums appropriated herein which are expended in the performance of functions of the Bureau of Reclamation shall be reimbursable or returnable to the extent and in the manner provided by law.

Any agency of the United States Government having title thereto is authorized to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation, without reimbursement, parts, equipment and supplies for aircraft excess to its needs.

No part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation, contained in this Act or in any prior Act, which represents amounts earned under the terms of a contract but remaining unpaid, shall be obligated for any other purpose, regardless of when such amounts are to be paid: *Provided*, That the incurring of any obligation prohibited by this paragraph shall be deemed a violation of section 665 of title 31 of the United States Code.

No funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation for operation and maintenance, except those derived from advances by water users, shall be used for the particular benefit of lands (a) within the boundaries of an irrigation district, (b) of any member of a water users' organization, or (c) of any individual, when such district, organization, or individual is in arrears for more than twelve months in the payment of charges due under a contract entered into with the United States pursuant to laws administered by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Not to exceed \$2,783,000 of the appropriation herein made for "Construction and rehabilitation, Bureau of Reclamation" shall be expended for completion of construction of the Coachella division of the All-American Canal system, Boulder Canyon project: *Provided*, That any sums thereof so expended in excess of the amount required to be repaid under the existing contract between the Coachella Valley

County Water District and the United States shall be repayable by said district to the United States unless said district shall be judicially determined by a court of competent jurisdiction to be not liable therefor.

Not to exceed 12 per centum of the construction allotment made by the Bureau of Reclamation for any project from the appropriation "Construction and Rehabilitation" contained in this Act shall be available for construction work by force account or on a hired-labor basis; except that not to exceed \$225,000 may on approval of the Commissioner be expended for construction work by force account on any one project or Missouri Basin unit when the work is unsuitable for contract or when excessive bids are received; and except in cases of emergencies local in character, so declared by the Commissioner.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for the Geological Survey to perform surveys, investigations, and research covering topography, geology, and the mineral and water resources of the United States, its Territories and possessions; classify lands as to mineral character and water and power resources; give engineering supervision to power permits and Federal Power Commission licenses; enforce departmental regulations applicable to oil, gas, and other mining leases, permits, licenses, and operating contracts; and publish and disseminate data relative to the foregoing activities; \$21,300,000, of which not to exceed \$13,455,000 shall be available for personal services, and of which \$3,300,000 shall be available only for cooperation with States or municipalities for water resources investigations: *Provided*, That the share of the Geological Survey in any topographic mapping or water resources investigations carried on in cooperation with any State or municipality shall not exceed 50 percentum of the cost thereof.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The amount appropriated for the Geological Survey shall be available for purchase of not to exceed eighty passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service for protection of confidential files; contracting for the furnishing of topographic maps and for the making of geophysical or other specialized surveys when it is administratively determined that such procedures are in the public interest; construction and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands for gaging stations; and payment of compensation and expenses (not to exceed \$10,000) of the person appointed by the President to participate as the representative of the United States in the administration of the compact consented to by the Act of May 31, 1949 (Public Law 82): *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President is authorized to appoint a retired officer as such representative, without prejudice to his status as a retired Army officer, and he shall receive such compensation and expenses in addition to his retired pay.

BUREAU OF MINES

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for promoting the conservation, exploration, development, production, and utilization of mineral resources, including fuels, in the United States, its Territories, and possessions; developing synthetics and substitutes; producing and distributing helium; and controlling fires in inactive coal deposits on public lands, and on private lands, with the consent of the owner; \$16,858,603, of which not to exceed \$10,446,575 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That the Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to make suitable arrangements with owners of private property or with a State or its subdivisions for payment of a sum equal to not less than one-half the amount of expenditure to be made for control or extinguishment of fires in inactive coal deposits from funds provided under the authorization of this Act except that expenditure of Federal funds for this purpose in any privately owned operating coal mine shall be limited to investigation and supervision.

HEALTH AND SAFETY

For expenses necessary for promotion of health and safety in mines and in the minerals industries, as authorized by law, \$3,790,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and improvement of facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Mines, to remain available until expended, \$1,587,412, of which not to exceed \$113,287 shall be available for personal services.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Mines, including such expenses in the regional offices, \$1,176,841, of which not to exceed \$1,018,434 shall be available for personal services.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of Mines may be expended for purchase of not to exceed one hundred and thirty passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; providing transportation services in isolated areas for employees, student dependents of employees, and other pupils, and such activities may be financed under cooperative arrangements; temporary and emergency contracts for personal services and employment of persons without regard to civil-service regulations as required in the conduct of programs for the control of fires in inactive coal deposits and flood prevention in anthracite mines; purchase and bestowal of certificates and trophies in connection with mine rescue and first-aid work: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private: *Provided further*, That power produced in the operation of the power plant of the Bureau of Mines at Louisiana, Missouri, in excess of the Bureau's needs may be sold to non-Federal purchasers, but the expenses of the Bureau in the production and sale of such excess power shall not exceed the total amount of such sales, and expenditures for the production of excess power shall not be deemed a charge against the total appropriations authorized by the Synthetic Liquid

Fuels Act, as amended: *Provided further*, That the sums made available for the current fiscal year to the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force for the acquisition of helium from the Bureau of Mines shall be transferred to the Bureau of Mines on July 1 of said fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the Bureau of Mines is authorized, during the current fiscal year, to sell directly or through any Government agency, including corporations, any metal or mineral product that may be manufactured in pilot plants operated by the Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

For expenses necessary for the management and protection of the areas and facilities administered by the National Park Service, including protection of lands in process of condemnation; and for plans, investigations, and studies of the recreational resources (exclusive of preparation of detail plans and working drawings) and archaeological values in river basins of the United States (except the Missouri River Basin); \$7,735,000, of which not to exceed \$6,584,342 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of the appropriation granted under this head for the fiscal year 1951 for the "Mississippi River Parkway" shall remain available during the current fiscal year.

MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of roads, trails, buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities essential to the operation of areas administered pursuant to law by the National Park Service, \$7,369,790, of which not to exceed \$4,193,747 shall be available for personal services.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and improvement, without regard to the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended (16 U. S. C. 451), of roads, trails, parkways, buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities; and the acquisition of lands, interests therein, improvements, and water rights; to remain available until expended, \$11,370,000, of which not to exceed \$945,000 shall be available for personal services, and of which \$1,150,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under the head "Independence National Historical Park, Pennsylvania", in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950, and \$3,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in section 4 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the National Park Service, including such expenses in the regional offices, \$1,171,774, of which not to exceed \$1,014,538 shall be available for personal services.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the National Park Service shall be available for purchase of not to exceed nineteen passenger motor vehicles for

replacement only; cleaning and repair of uniforms for National Capital Parks police and guards; and the objects and purposes specified in the Act of August 7, 1946 (16 U. S. C. 17j-2).

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for conservation, management, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources; operation of the industrial properties within the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770); maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge; purchase or rent of land, and functions related to wildlife management in California (16 U. S. C. 695-695c); and not to exceed \$30,000 for payment, in the discretion of the Secretary, for information or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service; \$6,678,196, of which not to exceed \$4,259,363 shall be available for personal services.

INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies and investigations respecting conservation, management, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources, including related aquatic plants and products; collection, compilation, and publication of information concerning such studies and investigations; and the performance of other functions related thereto; as authorized by law; \$3,858,986, of which not to exceed \$2,487,629 shall be available for personal services.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources and the acquisition of lands and interests therein, including continuing the construction of fish cultural facilities on lands owned by the State of South Dakota; to remain available until expended, \$733,742, of which not to exceed \$146,324 shall be available for personal services.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Fish and Wildlife Service, including such expenses in the regional offices, \$806,631, of which not to exceed \$678,319 shall be available for personal services.

FEDERAL AID IN FISH RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 9, 1950 (Public Law 681), amounts equal to the revenues described in section 3 of said Act and credited during the next preceding fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATION OF PRIBILOF ISLANDS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of February 26, 1944, as amended (16 U. S. C. 631a-631q), amounts equal to 60 per centum of the proceeds covered into the Treasury during the next preceding fiscal year from the sale of sealskins and other products, to remain

available for expenditure during the current and next succeeding fiscal years.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service shall be available for purchase of not to exceed seventy-four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; purchase of not to exceed six aircraft for replacement only; publication and distribution of bulletins as authorized by law (7 U. S. C. 417); rations or commutation of rations for officers and crews of vessels at rates not to exceed \$2 per man per day; repair of damage to public roads within and adjacent to reservation areas caused by operations of the Fish and Wildlife Service; options for the purchase of land at not to exceed \$1 for each option; facilities incident to such public recreational uses on conservation areas as are not inconsistent with their primary purposes; and the maintenance and improvement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Fish and Wildlife Service and to which the United States has title, and which are utilized pursuant to law in connection with management and investigation of fish and wildlife resources.

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including expenses of the offices of the Governors of Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, as authorized by law (48 U. S. C., secs. 61, 531, 1422, 1431a (c)), expenses of the Government of the Virgin Islands including the agricultural station, as authorized by law (48 U. S. C. 1405, 7 U. S. C. 386g), and expenses of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands appointed pursuant to the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress; compensation and mileage of members of the legislatures in Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and American Samoa as authorized by law (48 U. S. C., secs. 87, 599, 1421d (e), and 1431a (c)); compensation and expenses of the judiciary in American Samoa as authorized by law (48 U. S. C. 1431a (c)) and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress; care of insane as authorized by law for Alaska (48 U. S. C. 46-50); grants to the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, in addition to current local revenues, for support of governmental functions; and not to exceed \$50,000 for personal services, household equipment and furnishings, and utilities necessary in the operation of the several Governors' houses; \$7,020,000, of which not to exceed \$811,865 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That the Territorial and local governments of the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands are authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That appropriations available for the Administration of Territories, including the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, may be expended for the purchase, maintenance, and operation of not to exceed four aircraft, 1 AK and 6 AKL type surface vessels, and such minor vessels as may be required, for official purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found by the Secretary to be necessary in carrying out the provisions of Article 6 (2) of the trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress.

ALASKA PUBLIC WORKS

For an additional amount for expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 24, 1949 (Public Law 264), to remain available until June 30, 1955, \$7,000,000, of which not to exceed \$463,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, and of which not to exceed \$333,000 shall be available for personal services.

CONSTRUCTION OF ROADS, ALASKA

For construction of roads, tramways, buildings, ferries, bridges, and trails, including surveys and plans for new road construction; acquisition of lands or interests in lands by purchase, donation, condemnation, or otherwise; to remain available until expended, \$20,000,000, of which not to exceed \$2,493,000 shall be available for personal services, and of which not to exceed \$8,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF ROADS, ALASKA

For operation and maintenance of roads, tramways, buildings, ferries, bridges, and trails, \$2,900,000, of which not to exceed \$1,935,840 shall be available for personal services.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The total of the amounts herein appropriated for construction, operation and maintenance of roads in Alaska shall be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for operation and maintenance shall be available only for the service of the current fiscal year.

Not to exceed 20 per centum of the amount herein appropriated for construction of roads in Alaska shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired labor basis.

CONSTRUCTION, ALASKA RAILROAD

For the authorized work of the Alaska Railroad, including improvements and new construction, to remain available until expended, \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this head may be transferred to the Alaska Railroad Special Fund for purposes of accounting and administration.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ALASKA RAILROAD

The Alaska Railroad Special Fund shall continue available until expended for the work authorized by law, including operation of facilities under the jurisdiction of the railroad in Mount McKinley National Park; operation and maintenance of oceangoing or coastwise vessels by ownership, charter, or arrangement with other branches of the Government service, for the purpose of providing additional facilities for transportation of freight, passengers, or mail, when deemed necessary for the benefit and development of industries or travel in the area served; and payment of compensation and expenses as authorized by section 42 of the Act of September 7, 1916 (5 U. S. C. 793), to be reimbursed as therein provided: *Provided*, That no one other than the general manager of said railroad, and one assistant general manager at not to exceed \$13,000 per annum, shall be paid an annual salary out of said fund of more than \$11,000.

VIRGIN ISLANDS PUBLIC WORKS

For an additional amount to carry out the provisions of the Act of December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 827), \$992,970, of which not to exceed \$63,270 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That the estimated project costs specified in said Act of December 20, 1944, shall not constitute limitations on amounts that may be expended for such projects: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the waterfront development project on Saint Thomas, and the amount included in the 1952 budget estimates for this project is hereby made available for school and hospital facilities in the Virgin Islands.

ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior (referred to herein as the Secretary), including teletype rentals and service; \$2,154,911, of which not to exceed \$1,890,798 shall be available for personal services.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 102. Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, aliens may be employed during the current fiscal year in the field service of the Department for periods of not more than thirty days in cases of emergency caused by fire, flood, storm, act of God, or sabotage.

SEC. 103. Appropriations in this Act available for travel expenses shall be available, for expenses of attendance of officers and employees at meetings or conventions of members of societies or associations concerned with the work of the bureau or office for which the appropriation concerned is made.

SEC. 104. Appropriations made in this Act shall be available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement or repair of buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: *Provided*, That no funds shall be made available under this authority until funds specifically made available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted.

SEC. 105. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropriation in this Act, in addition to the amounts included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threatening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior: *Provided*, That appropriations made in this Act for fire suppression purposes shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred during the preceding fiscal year.

SEC. 106. Appropriations made in this Act shall be available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will contribute to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activity in the same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30, 1932 (31 U. S. C. 686): *Provided*, That reimbursements for cost of supplies, materials and equipment, and for services rendered may be credited to the appropriation current at the time such reimbursements are received.

SEC. 107. Appropriations made in this Act shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) when authorized by the Secretary; maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; payment for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and the payment of dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members.

SEC. 108. The balances of all contract authorizations heretofore granted to the Interior Department or any of its bureaus or offices, which remain unobligated on June 30, 1952, are hereby rescinded.

SEC. 109. Transfers to the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 of property, other than real, excess to the needs of the Navy Department may be made during the current fiscal year at the request of the Secretary of the Interior without reimbursement or transfer of funds when required by the Interior Department for operations conducted in the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and American Samoa.

TITLE II—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

REVOLVING FUND

For an additional amount for the revolving fund established under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, to provide for advances to the Virgin Islands Corporation as authorized by law, \$2,595,000.

GRANTS

For payment to the Virgin Islands Corporation in the form of grants, for expenses incurred during the current fiscal year, as authorized by section 8 of the Virgin Islands Corporation Act, in the conduct of activities budgeted as predominantly nonrevenue producing, \$130,000: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1951, for estimated losses to be sustained during the fiscal year 1951, shall remain available for estimated losses to be sustained during the fiscal year 1952: *Provided further*, That an amount equal to the excess of grants for estimated losses for revenue producing activities over the actual loss for the fiscal year 1951 and the estimated loss for the fiscal year 1952 shall be transferred from the appropriation for "Grants" to the "Revolving Fund, Virgin Islands Corporation" and shall be merged therewith.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

During the current fiscal year the Virgin Islands Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available to it and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal-year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out its programs as set forth in the budget for the fiscal year 1952: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$130,000 shall be available for administrative expenses (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the Corporation, covering the categories set forth in the 1952 Budget estimates for such expenses.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of the money appropriated by this Act or by it made available for expenditure by the Virgin Islands Corporation which is in excess of 75 per centum of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons which the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by the Department of the Interior or the Virgin Islands Corporation during such fiscal year in the performance of—

(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material, shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2): *Provided*, That this section shall not be construed as having application to the preparation for publication of reports and maps resulting from authorized scientific and engineering investigations and surveys, to photography incident to the compilation and reproduction of maps and reports, or to photocopying of permanent records for preservation.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government in the District of Columbia whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance and two passenger motor vehicles assigned one to the Secretary and one to the Under Secretary), unless such appropriation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the compensation of employees performing such duties.

SEC. 303. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and ten, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

SEC. 304. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this Act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the

affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence, and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That in cases of emergency, caused by fire, flood, storm, act of God, or sabotage, persons may be employed for periods of not more than thirty days and be paid salaries and wages without the necessity of inquiring into their membership in any organization.

SEC. 305. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

- (a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;
- (b) to positions filled from within the department;
- (c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;
- (d) to positions the personnel of which are engaged in health and safety, law enforcement, operation and maintenance, soil and moisture, and forestry activities in the field, exclusive of administrative personnel not directly connected with the operation of any such specific activity;
- (e) to seasonal and casual workers:

Provided further, That with the exception of the agencies and functions listed in (b) through (e) above, not more than 90 per centum of the amounts shown in the budget estimates for personal services shall be available for such purpose: *Provided further*, That when the total number of personnel subject to this section has been reduced to 90 per centum of the total provided for in the budget estimates for 1952, this section may cease to apply.

This Act may be cited as the "Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1952."

Approved August 31, 1951.